

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 638

CS 501 461

AUTHOR Harms, L. S., Ed.; And Others
TITLE Policy Dialog on the Right of Everyone in Hawaii to Communicate: An Informal Report by and for the Dialog Participants. Communication in Hawaii Series Report Number 2.
INSTITUTION Hawaii Univ., Manoa.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 74p.; Developed from the Right of Everyone in Hawaii to Communicate Dialog Sessions held in March and April, 1976 in Hawaii
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Civil Liberties; *Communication Problems; *Communications; Community Involvement; Conference Reports; Cultural Pluralism; Ethnic Groups; *Mass Media; Newspapers; *Policy Formation; Radio; Television
IDENTIFIERS *Hawaii

ABSTRACT

In this informal report, all but a few of the pages were written after the dialog sessions of March and April 1976, held on four of the Hawaiian Islands--Kauai, Oahu, Maui, and Hawaii. All of the selections were written by participants in the dialogs. The task of the dialog sessions was to build an understanding of the specific implications of an emerging right-to-communicate policy in Hawaii. This document contains a discussion of the dialog topic and descriptive reports of each of the sessions held, with lists of key persons, of participating organizations, and of policy issues. Some of the policy issues discussed are as follows: Are students and new immigrants taught adequate formal communication skills in schools? How can community groups and individuals gain access to the news media? How can a community maintain its cultural diversity and pluralism through development of communication rights? How can people be motivated to provide more citizen input at state and local government hearings? (JM)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

POLICY DIALOG ON THE RIGHT OF
EVERYONE IN HAWAII TO
COMMUNICATE

An Informal Report by and for the Dialog Participants

Edited by

L. S. Harms, Jim Richstad, Bruce Barnes and Kathleen A. Kie

COMMUNICATION IN HAWAII SERIES

Report Number 2

Published and Distributed by the

COMMUNICATION RESEARCH GROUP

a joint project

of the

Social Sciences and Linguistics Institute

and the

Hawaii Research Center for Futures Study

Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa

June 1976

ED127638

196/108 501 461

C O N T E N T S

PREFACE	I
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	II
THE DIALOG TOPIC	I
KAUAI DIALOG	7
OAHU DIALOG	22
MAUI DIALOG	39
HAWAII DIALOG	53

PREFACE

This is an informal report. Its content grew out of Dialog Sessions on Kauai, Oahu, Maui, and Hawaii on the Right of Everyone in Hawaii to Communicate. These Dialog Sessions were held in March and April, 1976.

All but a few of the pages of this report were written after the Dialogs. All of the writing was done by persons who had participated in those Dialogs. Most of the pages were written by the academic humanists--persons who work in a university and deal with human values as a major part of their work. But important contributions came from other thoughtful persons as well, for instance, a journalist and a student. We think you will find these "after thoughts" interesting reading.

We have not attempted to draw conclusions from the content of the report because most of us feel more Dialog is required before conclusions about the Right to Communicate are possible. The idea is both important and complex--as most participants have said in one way or another. It is hoped that this informal report will contribute to that further Dialog

Two related developments may also help to generate additional Dialog on the Right to Communicate and related matters.

- Several participants have suggested that Informal Communication Workshops should be held from time to time in many communities across Hawaii. These Workshops would deal with a wide range of communication problems and possibilities including policy issues, development of new skills, examination of new technologies, etc. and, of course, the emerging Right to Communicate.
- A Communication Directory for and about Hawaii is being prepared to help those of us with particular interests in communication to contact others with similar interests. The Directory will include sections on: Women and Men in Communication; Communication Organizations and Associations; Communication Projects; and, Publications.

Together, the Communication Workshops and the Communication Directory can help us continue the Dialog on Communication in Hawaii. The Directory is being published as Report Number 1 in the Communication in Hawaii Series.

Ms. Annette Lew of the Hawaii Committee for the Humanities deserves a special Thank You from all of us. On the "Acknowledgments" page that follows are the names of the persons and organizations who made possible the Policy Dialog on the Right of Everyone in Hawaii to Communicate.

A copy of this report is being sent to each Dialog Participant. Single copies of this report are available to any interested person without charge while the supply lasts.

Aloha.

The Editors

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Academic Humanists

Professor Dana Bekeart, Philosophy, Kauai Community College, Lihue
Professor Jose Bulatao, Jr., Communication, Kauai Community College, Lihue
Professor Edward Fujimoto, Communication, University of Hawaii at Hilo, Hilo
Professor Will Griffiths, Philosophy, Maui Community College, Kahului
Professor Leila Kanno, Language Arts, University of Hawaii at Hilo, Hilo
Professor Charles Lees, Philosophy, Chaminade College, Honolulu
Professor David Lees, Philosophy, Maui Community College, Kahului
Professor Richard Miller, Law, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu
Professor Dennis Ogawa, American Studies, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu
Professor Clyde Sakamoto, Communication, Maui Community College, Kahului
Professor Helen Sina, English, Kauai Community College, Lihue

Statewide Sponsors

Hawaii Research Center for Futures Study
Richard Barber, Acting Director
East-West Communication Institute
Jack Lyle, Director
Right to Communicate Working Group
Jean d'Arcy, Chairman, Paris
United Nations Association/Hawaii
Mary Gray, President
Hawaii Committee for the Humanities
Annette Lew, Executive Director

Island Sponsors

"Communication Workshop," Kauai
Honolulu Community Media Council,
Oahu
Max Roffman, Chairman
Maui Jaycees, Maui
Big Island Press Club, Hawaii
David Shapiro, President

Resource Persons and Rapporteurs

Ms. Gladys Boswell, Hawaii

Mr. John Burgess, Hawaii

Mr. Hugh Clark, Hawaii

Ms. Barbara Daly, Kauai

Mr. John Dobovan, Hawaii

Ms. Sheila Dobovan, Hawaii

Ms. Faith Garan, Kauai

Mr. Glen Grant, Oahu

Ms. Alice Hanen, Maui

Ms. Jean Holmes, Kauai

Mr. Ben Ikemori, Maui

Ms. Lori Lai, Maui

Mr. Mike Middlesworth, Oahu

Ms. Caroline Nakamura, Kauai

Mr. Stephen Okamura, Oahu

Mr. George Omen, Oahu

Mr. Don Ordonez, Maui

Mr. Roy Pacubez, Maui

Mr. Alan Parker, Hawaii

Rev. Olin Pendleton, Oahu

Ms. Melinda Riola, Kauai

Mr. Dave Shapiro, Hawaii

Ms. Phyllis von Stroheim, Kauai

Ms. Edith Webster, Oahu

Mr. Robert Youngman, Hawaii

Statewide Project Directors

Dr. L. S. Harms, Honolulu

Dr. Jim Richstad, Honolulu

Mr. Bruce Barnes, Honolulu

Ms. Kathleen A. Kie, Honolulu

Island Coordinators

Dr. Richard Collier, Kauai

Ms. Ah Jook Ku, Oahu

Mr. Glen Reyes, Maui

Mr. Fred Reedy, Hawaii

THE DIALOG TOPIC

THE EMERGING RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE

INTRODUCTION

The emerging Right to Communicate is capable of changing human communication in far reaching ways and, for this reason, a series of community level dialogs on this topic were held in Hawaii.

The Right to Communicate is still in its early stages, and our Policy Dialog in Hawaii was an important part of an effort to clarify and develop it. At this early stage, the idea requires not only academic studies but also a broadly based dialog, especially community level multicultural dialog. Development of this idea has important ramifications for public policy within Hawaii and for Hawaii's inter-relationships with the broader national, Pacific and world communities. The Right to Communicate is one of those "great Ideas" that will affect basic human values and lifestyles.

The broad task of our dialog sessions was to begin to build understanding of the specific implications for communication policy in Hawaii of an emerging Right to Communicate. Usually, the Dialog Sessions moved from specific issues to general perspectives. Typically, they began with local issues, introduced the value perspectives of the larger Human Rights framework, and then examined local policy alternatives and the values inherent in these alternatives.

BACKGROUND

Some of the basic work on the global Right to Communicate grew out of Hawaii. In summer 1974, after several years of study and discussion, Harms and Richstad authored a Unesco draft resolution on the Right to Communicate. The resolution was reviewed and revised in September in Mexico City at the International Broadcast Institute (IBI) general meeting, and further examined in Paris at Unesco. After a total re-drafting, a new resolution was formally introduced by Sweden at the 18th General Conference of Unesco in fall 1974. That resolution was discussed intensely, amended by the Netherlands, and passed unanimously, with seven abstentions. The resolution charges Unesco to study and analyze the Right to Communicate.

About a year ago, the Director General of Unesco sent a letter and questionnaire to all Member States and leading professional organizations around the world. Using the responses to this inquiry, Unesco prepared in June 1976 a position paper that began the formal process of analysis and definition of the idea. That paper on the Right to Communicate will provide the base for the discussions during the 19th General Conference of Unesco in fall 1976, and for Unesco discussion and study programs over the next several years.

At Unesco and in many corners of the world, it is believed that this new idea must grow out of a multicultural perspective. Specific communication rights

In the past such as freedom of expression and free flow of information have too often developed out of a Western context that is not culturally acceptable in many communities of our interrelated world. To date, study and discussion of the Right to Communicate have been carried on at Unesco, at the national government level, in international and national professional organizations, in University of Hawaii seminars, and in community dialog sessions in Hawaii.

A most important contribution to the development of a Right to Communicate at the community level in Hawaii will come and can only come out of dialog among small groups of interested persons within each community itself. Previously elements of a Right to Communicate such as access rights and "sunshine" or open meeting questions had been discussed in Hawaii.

FOCUS

The Dialog Sessions focused on building understanding in Hawaii on the Right to Communicate. The focal point was on the interrelationship between general values and specific values. Significantly, the theme for the September 1975 Conference of the International Broadcast Institute* (IBI) had been the reciprocal influence of global and domestic communication policies.

At that IBI Conference, one Working Committee of about thirty persons from many different countries met on four consecutive days to discuss the Right to Communicate. The Committee "agreed that the main purpose of a new description was to facilitate discussion and study . . . " on the policy implications of the concept and toward that end the Committee drafted the following statement:

Everyone has the right to communicate. It [Communication] is a basic human need and is the foundation of all social organization. It [The right to communicate] belongs to individuals and communities, between and among each other. The right has been long recognized internationally and the exercise of it needs constantly to evolve and expand. Taking account of changes in society and developments in technology, adequate resources--human, economic and technological--should be made available to all mankind for fulfillment of the need for interactive participatory communication and implementation of that right.

The full IBI membership has adopted this statement. Many of the policy concerns expressed in the Committee at Cologne were similar to those that had been set

*The London-based International Broadcast Institute has a worldwide membership that includes leaders from Unesco/Paris, International Telecommunication Union/Geneva, Asian Broadcast Union/Sydney, "Committee of 77"/"developing nations", East-West Communication Institute/Honolulu, from national offices of telecommunication and information ministries in First, Second, and Third World countries such as Canada, Yugoslavia, and Guyana, and from research institutes in Cambridge, London, Tel Aviv, Delhi, Singapore and Honolulu.

forth in a Bicentennial sponsored study of Issues in Communication Planning for Hawaii (Barber, Grace, Harms and Richstad, 1975).

Based on our experience, three specific topic areas seemed suitable for dialog groups in Hawaii. The short titles for these topics were: policy ethics, positive law, and cultural values. More descriptive and locally relevant titles were used for the actual Dialog Sessions. The first of these topics is centered on an area of rapidly developing interest, especially as related to communication planning for Hawaii. Both the positive law and cultural values topics have traditionally been associated with Human Rights and have a rich history. Taken together, these three topics can help to build understanding on the implications of various policy alternatives open to Hawaii.

In one way or another, these three topic areas were considered in each Dialog Session, and are expanded next.

Policy Ethics

Communication policy formulation involves bringing together the legal and traditional ways of a community into an effective strategy to meet the human communication needs of the community. Such formulation brings both the legal and the moral attributes into an emerging sense of communication policy ethics. Policy ethics serve as an overall guide and foundation to policy-makers, and encompass the range of individual and community values and traditions on the role of communication in society, and the ways that seem appropriate to organize communication in society. Such an overall framework permits careful, rational examination of specific and particular values and issues in a broader context.

In the context of a Right to Communicate, the policy questions are plentiful. It is a truism, for example, that every person and every social organization has vital information needs for survival, growth and quality of life. The policy and practical questions become how and to what extent and at what cost and for whom will such information be provided or made available. Should it be the policy of Hawaii, for example, to provide equitable communication services at standard costs regardless of place of residency within the state? And in the case of a small community within a larger community, what will be the controlling communication relations between the communities? Numerous other issue areas raise similar community questions.

Three special factors or considerations influence communication policy ethics formulation in Hawaii. They are geographical isolation from the rest of the world (resulting in spotty and expensive communication both to and from Hawaii), separation of peoples within the state by ocean barriers (making for even spottier and more costly and difficult communication services), and the multicultural aspects of the State's residents (raising special questions on how communication can affect often delicate intercultural relations).

The very direct questions that arise are whether the residents of Hawaii in the one case should have communication rights and opportunities comparable to

those American citizens residing on the Mainland. In the second case, the same questions can be asked for those state residents not living on Oahu--do they have the right to the same service, access and control of communication as Oahu residents? Of course, many persons prefer this "deprivation," but that is another issue to explore in building communication policy ethics.

Formulating communication policy ethics also requires examination of the means by which smaller communities can have an effective voice in the large communication policy questions on local, national and global levels.

Positive Law

The term positive law refers to the "actual law of actual states" that can be enforced through a court system. The interlocking body of law and legal agreements that affects the communication services of a community are formulated and enforced at several levels. In the case of communication, an important body of regulatory law on the use of the spectrum ("air waves") is formulated at the International Telecommunication Union in Geneva. Thus, this U.N. Agency regulates one part of communication resource usage for the entire world and affects, for example, the availability and cost of satellite services in Hawaii. Another major body of regulatory law that affects Hawaii is formulated by the U.S. Federal Communications Commission. At the moment, serious rate discrimination problems continue to exist and appear likely to be brought to court in the next few months. Cable television regulation and mailgram services are other related areas of concern. Still another body of communication law is formulated in Hawaii, for example, in the recent and still controversial "sunshine law." Several state boards and agencies are having difficulties with the law, and many seek to have it "softened." Citizen groups supporting the law may seek to have "tougher" provisions and fewer exceptions. This is a statewide issue of great concern and one that goes to the heart of value systems.

The development to telecommunications technology has been so rapid that current regulatory procedures are no longer adequate. In Europe, for example, several countries are finding it necessary to re-examine both the whole body of communication law and regulations from new perspectives, and to examine procedures for regulation across the entire field of communication.

Another important dialog issue focuses on the isolation of Hawaii by the world's greatest ocean. This makes many laws and regulations developed for communication in densely populated and large continents inappropriate. A systematic review on this point is overdue.

More generally, recent developments in telecommunications technology make possible a much wider Right to Communicate for everyone in Hawaii, through such things as two-way, participatory cable television, for example. Dialog can examine the meaning for those of us who live in Hawaii of these changed conditions.

Cultural Values

Through most of human history, communication has not been influenced by a policy ethic or regulated by positive law, but rather it has been guided by the shared values of members of small cultural communities. Communication policy in the cultural context of a small community is usually implicit rather than explicit. It finds its expression in instructions to the young such as, "children should be seen but not heard," or in cultural ideals, "the strong, silent type," or in proverbial wisdoms, "speak the truth and the truth shall make you free." In stable communities, the implicit communication policy evident in expressions of cultural values effectively guide communication and keep communication practices in harmony with community expectations.

The effectiveness of community cultural values as a major source of policy for human communication appears to have been diminishing for the past two centuries, and drastically so in recent times with the development of communication technologies such as telegraph, radio, television, and satellites. Since about 1970, when the current communication revolution gained force, the communication satellite and the long range jet both have contributed in a major way to the current pressures on human communication and cultures. And we have seen the terms communication imperialism and cultural imperialism come in to widespread use, especially in the small ethnic communities of the developed world and in the developing Third World nations.

These forms of perceived imperialism appear to have their source in deeply held cultural values which may be quite appropriate in the cultural context of a single community or among a number of culturally similar communities. But, these same values when extended suddenly onto the global scale have different and unintended consequences in other cultural communities. Thus, values that are deeply held in Hawaii about access to and flow of information can contribute in Western Samoa to the decline of family and village traditions. Many of the recent "clashes" between "locals" and "immigrants" in the schools reflect deeply held values in both communication and culture. In what sense do students have a Right to Communicate?

In some respects the value problem that arises is a very old one, but its scale and sudden impact in many communities of the world today is unprecedented. Is it possible to develop a multicultural or culture-fair Right to Communicate which enriches and enhances cultural values in a way that does not inadvertently destroy the cultures of distant communities--and which might also provide a value base for a system of policy ethics and a body of positive law?

ON PURPOSES

The first purpose of the dialogs on the Right to Communicate was to build understanding in local community terms of this emerging idea. There were, however, two additional purposes.

One of these purposes was to develop the nucleus of a group that will continue the dialog on the Right to Communicate in a variety of ways within various communities beyond the project itself.

The other purpose was, as Hawaii 2000 has done for futures dialog, to stimulate and provide a preliminary model for dialog at the community level on the Right to Communicate elsewhere in the world. We feel strongly that if everyone is to have a Right to Communicate everyone should have a say in what that right should be. Most simply, the idea requires dialog.

K A U A I D I A L O G

KEY PERSONS, ORGANIZATIONS AND POLICY ISSUES

Island Sponsor: "Communication Workshop"

Date and Place: Thursday, March 3, 5-9 p.m. Lihue United Church, Parish Hall

Island Coordinator: Dr. Richard Collier

Participating Organization: YWCA

Lihue Hongwanji

Kauai Community College

Academic Humanists: Professor Jose Bulatao, Communication
Professor Dana Beckeart, Philosophy
Professor Helen Sina, English

Resource Persons and
Rapporteurs:

Ms. Barbara Daly

Ms. Jean Holmes

Ms. Phyllis von Stroheim

Ms. Faith Garan

Ms. Caroline Nakamura

Ms. Melinda Riola

Policy Issues: Are students and new immigrants taught adequate formal communication skills in schools? How can mature adults update their skills?

How can new immigrants--without being hassled--learn the "Kauai lifestyle" and other informal communication patterns?

Are media representation and media access equalized throughout the State? Is the Kauai Story fairly reported across Hawaii?

INTRODUCTION

The dialog on Kauai was held on March 3rd, a Thursday evening, in the Parish Hall of the Lihue United Church. More than thirty "out-of-school-adults" gathered at about five for dinner and stayed on until past nine. It was an historic evening. For the first time anywhere in the world, a wide variety of citizens had met to discuss the policy implications of the new Right to Communicate idea.

The announcements indicated the topic for the evening was the Right to Communicate, and that the starting point would be a series of questions:

- Who speaks?
- Who listens?
- Who should "shut up"?
- How can minorities and newcomers be heard?
- Is the "Kauai Story" fairly reported?

As it turned out, these questions were only some of the ones that came up in the discussion.

The evening began with dinner and conversation. Along with dessert, a short movie on "cultural attitudes" was shown. The movie was followed by a communication game called Bafa Bafa. The game served to introduce participants to each other, to alert them to their own cultural beliefs, and to prepare them for the serious dialog to follow later in the evening.

After the Bafa Bafa game, the participants formed three small dialog groups. Each group was led by one of the Academic Humanists. The Humanist focused the dialog either on a general communication policy issue or a set of closely related specific policy issues. Present also in each group was a resource person who was closely associated with the issue under discussion, a rapporteur, and one of the project directors who served also as a general resource person on the Right to Communicate concept. The dialog groups met for nearly two hours.

The evening ended with a summary of the discussions of the three groups. One member of each of the three dialog groups summarized the groups discussion for all the participants. There were a few additional questions directed to the humanists and to the project directors. The evening activities were concluded.

The adult participants came from many walks of life. For instance, some were retired and had come up through the plantations. Others were newly arrived immigrants to Kauai--from the Philippines and the U.S. mainland. Others were active in communication media on Kauai. While the participants were not a "cross section of the community", they were people who had not talked with each other previously even though they had wanted to talk over a number of common communication problems.

Each of the Humanists was asked both to lead the dialog groups and to prepare a short statement after they had a chance to think over the substance of the dialogs. These statements are included in their entirety on the following pages.

In his paper, Professor Bulatao sketches the details of the Kauai community that influence the style of communication on the island. He notes that communication has recently been "drastically influenced by the outside world" through immigration, through mass media presentation of events and ideas from the outside, and through mass media presentation of events and ideas from the outside, and through Kauai residents who travel and study elsewhere and return with changed outlooks. He observes in close detail the patterns of communication among residents of the Garden Isle. He concluded that the Right to Communicate dialog was a significant attempt where "members of the groups began speaking with one another . . . understanding one another".

In her paper, Professor Sina also takes a wide-angle look at communication on Kauai. She discusses the attitudes about communication that are found on Kauai and relates these to concepts of distance, ethnic origins, and mass media. She notes that the "complexity of multiple backgrounds creates communication difficulties" and that Kauai residents watch TV news that is mostly about Oahu. She concludes that "people on Kauai need opportunities to explore communication options."

The third paper by Professor Beckeart asks "Can effective communication lessen social conflicts?" His paper asserts that it can and suggests ways in which this may be possible. He notes that conflicts are often found "during the high school years" but that the problems are not restricted to this age group. He suggests that educational programs in intercultural communication would help to "bridge the gap" and enable, for instance, a newly arrived Ilocano youth to join into the activities of his age group. He observes that "our people need to be exposed positively and intelligently to each others' cultures." He adds that the Right to Communicate Idea should include a strong moral dimension.

KAUAI PERSPECTIVES ON THE RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE

by Jose Bulatao, Jr.

Kauai, a rural-agrarian island with plantation towns strung through a belt road that generally girds its shoreline, transcends a hollywoodized concept of a simplistic, mid-Pacific paradise. Beyond the sunset, beneath the swaying palms, and within the verdant valleys beats a life-pulse of people in a microcosm.

To the casual viewer, the island seems remote, if not aloof in its resistance to change. Shopping centers were virtually non-existent until the late fifties, and the opening of the likes of MacDonald's brought protests decrying the inevitable onslaught of progress and the "mainlandization" of Kauai. The nostalgic appreciation for the perpetuation of the old ways is still apparent curiously among both those who are island-born and dwell upon "remembering when" as well as those who fled the plastic society of the Establishment and have become the voices of concern for the conservationists and environmentalists. The preoccupation for things "local" is evident in the coconut wireless, be it the backyard, over-the-fence exchange of gossip, communicating in pidgin in the presence of a perplexed haole, or the special interpretation of events and affairs pertinent to the island that exists accordingly and in varying degrees of effectiveness.

The multi-cultural atmosphere of the island creates a constant urgency to develop and maintain a territoriality for self-existence and a mutuality for socio-metric concerns.

Thirty-five years ago, camps or districts within the plantation towns were definitely compartmentalized into groups of (if you will pardon the expression) "ethnic purity." This did not mean, however, that each ethnic group was mutually exclusive. The entire community had access to the Japanese bon dance, the Filipino Rizal Day celebration, the intermittent Puerto Rican dance, or the American Fourth of July carnival. An underlying respect and appreciation for ethnic customs prevailed and is still maintained somewhat largely because the plantation town is relatively close-knit.

Since then, however, the inter-personal and inter-cultural relationships among Kauai's populace have been drastically influenced by the outside world. Over the years, residents in their plantation towns found that they could no longer be pre-occupied merely with the concerns of their immediate environment. Where the children inevitably carried on with tilling the soil in the canefields or got married and bore children soon after graduating from high school, better options and vaster opportunities soon became attainable. The key, of course, was education.

So while parents sacrificed, their offspring went to college, primarily off the island. What was once an avenue for the privileged became a highway for the masses.

Also, exposure to the outside world came through the option of joining a branch of the armed services, and the youngsters went far beyond the "big city" on Oahu to get their own look at the world out there.

All this, however, led to a brain drain on the island as the young people saw new horizons of social and economic opportunity stretch before them in different and challenging environments. Many of those who went away and yearned to return could not or would not because of the lack of jobs.

In the meantime, nearly all of the neighborhood movie theaters were replaced by the more convenient television set in the living room as a commodity for entertainment and information. Thus, contact with the rest of the world became much more constant and immediate.

Kauai residents had become peripatetic (actually and vicariously), not merely to the confines of the island's sun-drenched shores, but also, to any corner of the globe, however remote. At the same time, the door leading out provided the way leading in for the transient, the developer, the opportunist, and the technologist. In three and a half decades, Kauai residents had not only lost the tranquility of the island's quaint semi-isolationism, but had also acquired the dichotomy of maintaining a rustic lifestyle and maneuvering the conveniences that cost a pretty penny.

Thus, within this framework, a communications workshop was held on Kauai as a means of bringing into focus, the theme: "The Right to Communicate." Gathered

together was a conglomerate of Island residents, each with a perspective, an interpretation, an inner struggle, and a desire to wrestle with the context of that theme.

Almost like shy children, the participants went through the initial phases of social inter-action, clinging to the content or the contrivances of familiarity, and all the while weighing the extent to which each could step away from the facade of social propriety.

With a Kentucky-fried chicken boxed meal, the finger-licking informality became prelude to intensive socializing. The group was then divided into two teams to play a game of inter-cultural propensity to allow a guise for role-playing without the residue of self-incriminating consequences. The natural follow-through was the group discussion, a socio-dynamic arrangement allowing for an array of personal insights and testimonies, to evoke levels of communication with responses verbalized or internalized. Thus, the group began to discover in one another, the strata of individual personalities and concerns as well as interpretations, issues, and priorities in identifying the problems inherent to effective communications.

Those problems particular to this island, however, are further intensified by the "life-types" prevalent on Kauai (but not necessarily present at this workshop). Some profiles follow. Among others:

There is Auntie Tita, grand dame of a clan, steeped in the traditions of her heritage, the ohana, the kapus, the reclamation of land.

She views her opponent, Mr. Smith, the haole government man representing an agency which seems deaf and insensitive to the pleas of the Hawaiian as an unbeloved infidel.

Mr. Smith, however, is the husband of Masako, a middle-aged Japanese woman who earned her degree in education in Iowa. She rationalizes that the Hawaiian claim is unreasonable and belittles the Hawaiian youngsters in her social studies class in high school.

Tony, a Portuguese boy in her class, is going steady with Kanani, Auntie Tita's daughter. He harbors a resentment for Mrs. Smith, "that jap who tink she haole," and spends more time at the beach surfing instead of going to school.

Next door to Auntie Tita lives Marla, a 20 year-old immigrant from the Philippines. She lives with her husband, Pedro, a 68 year-old retiree from the plantation. Already, they have one child with another on the way. She can hardly speak English and spends most of her day in the house, afraid to communicate with anyone.

Occasionally, Suzie from the Department of Social Services and Health will visit her with the aid of an interpreter. Suzie has been trying to get Marla on the food stamps program. From what Marla can understand of the program, she is reluctant to enroll, afraid that people will call her "hippie."

She has seen those types in the local supermarket, the unkempt, foul-smelling Bobs, Daves, and Williams buying food with their "magic money" or standing along the roadside thumbing rides to Haena or Polihale.

They've been seen and hassled, too, by Butchie and Biggie, the poi-dog mixed-breeds and frequent outcasts of family units that have deteriorated. They roam the parks looking for an easy prey to "bust up."

There is, also, Romeo, the immigrant kid clinging to the language and lifestyle of his homeland, and therefore, a target for ridicule and harassment by those who consider him different and subservient.

Every once in a while, there are, also, people like Gerald. These are persons who went "outside" and chose to return to the island with nothing to do, afraid to venture out once more, but frustrated with the situation here. For them, for the moment, at least, drugs and drinking booze are the answer.

Then, there is the enlightened crowd, the group of professionals always ready with an analysis or a solution. They have their constant meetings and their reams of resolutions, but generally, they don't last too long on the island. For every one that leaves, two others pop up to replace him (or her).

The types of people projected here serve to illustrate the fact that the communication processes between and among them are dependent largely on situational and dispositional factors as well as the cultural, sociological, and psychological levels of analyses possible (or impossible) in the discourse. Too often, the right to communicate is hindered by seething, silent resentment on one hand or outbursts of physical violence on the other.

Add to that the problem that the island is small in size to the extent that it is considered a long journey to drive from Kekaha to Lihue (a distance of 28 miles one-way) by those who do not "travel" frequently. Yet, a woman from Waimea will fly to Oklahoma to be with her pregnant daughter, while she may have never been to Hanalei because the ride is "too far." Yet, this is an island dependent on its cars. According to recent statistics, there is one motor vehicle for every 2.5 persons on the island. There is bound to be a procession of automobiles headed to or from athletic events, parties, carnivals, beauty pageants, and funerals. There is far less chance for a traffic snarl at community theater plays, public hearings, PTA meetings (now defunct in many of the schools), and political rallies. Thus, we see here some indication of where interests lie.

But it is because of the size of the island the relatively close proximity of our towns, neighborhoods, and homes that the threads of our lifestyles become more tightly loomed. The threads of our individual lives are interwoven both horizontally and vertically, creating interlocking patterns on the tapestry of life here. Too often, the threads are knotted, twisted, and gnarled or hung loosely.

The Kauai resident is subject to looming loyalties. Stands are taken in accordance with "my family . . .", "my friends . . .", "my community . . .", "my church . . .", "my union . . .", "my team . . .", "my club . . .", "my school . . .", "my political connections . . .", " . . . right or wrong."

Those who choose to be honest and forthright in their statements of opinion are often branded as foolhardy visionaries or downright creeps. They are regarded with suspicion as radicals and breeders of contempt and disorder. It becomes convenient and comfortable to maintain a middle-of-the-road position with conservative leanings.

In essence, the right to communicate effectively is much more difficult on Kauai, then, say, Honolulu. In a metropolis, one can be assured of a greater measure of personal independence, much less some anonymity if he considers it to be desirable or advantageous. On Kauai, the looming loyalties take greater precedence and often times thwart the person's right to communicate.

A resident on Kauai, in his actions and speech, must consider not only how others will react to him, but also how his family will be affected. The Kauaiian is well aware of the undercurrents of prejudices that persist and are passed on over the dining table, at beer busts, or through ritualistic phone calls.

Yet, in spite of the barriers imposed upon the right to communicate (from within and without) there is still a desire to attain that right. Certainly, the workshop held on the island was a noteworthy attempt to define the problems and to explore the avenues.

In surveying the problems, the opportunity arose for those gathered to be cognizant of the fine intricacies involved in human inter-action. The group went beyond speaking to and past each other. The members in the group began speaking with one another, taking the time to listen to what was being said to grasp the significance of the statements made to attain levels of understanding one another.

The workshop, then, served well as a springboard for further attempts of establishing dialogue, and perhaps, the means for effective communication.

COMMUNICATION ON KAUAI: LIMITS AND POSSIBILITIES

by Helen Sina

Living on Kauai affects attitudes about communication. Kauai is small enough for its citizens to feel that real communication must be interpersonal, yet it is large enough, and parts of it remote enough, to require communication technology. It is close enough to a large population center to participate in major communication media, yet far enough as an outer island to experience physical isolation that are not overcome by the media. Its population is small enough for people to feel that they know nearly everyone, but its diversity of backgrounds and interests are bases for many communication failures and failures to communicate. Many citizens and tourists enjoy Kauai as an anachronism with older, more natural values, yet they are quick to use each new technological advance.

Concepts of distance are shaped by Kauai. Kauai defines possibility. For a young child, "far" is going from Hanapepe to McDonalds in Lihue. This is a distance of about sixteen miles. Sixteen miles is a fair percentage of the nearly one hundred miles of main road which almost circle the island. Newly arrived

Kauaians often develop increasing reluctance to travel "far" without sufficient motivation even though they might have thought little of traveling much greater distances on the mainland, on Oahu, or in a foreign country. As newcomers they might welcome the opportunity to drive from Lihue to a beach on the other side of the island; after living on Kauai for a few years, they are more likely to settle for a closer beach.

Many young students have difficulty visualizing the rest of their country where distances are thought of in straight lines rather than in relation to "mauka" and "makai." Because the mainland is beyond their water-defined circle, it often has a fantasy quality in which San Francisco could be the capital of Chicago or Florida could be next to Texas. West coast cities and states are more familiar to them because relatives are more likely to have visited or attended schools in the western states. When asked to distinguish the difference between Hanalei to McDonalds "far" and Kauai to the mainland "far," youngsters are often lost, speaking of "a million miles" or "really far" or "farrrr" with a wide wave of the arms.

Face-to-face communication is an advantage Kauaians feel makes their island special. It is difficult for them to feel that reversing the roles of communication and transportation systems is better than what they now have. Such a reversal could be a real advantage for many senior citizens and those in remote areas, but it would be less desirable than people traveling the distance necessary to be together in person.

Communication on Kauai is affected by both old and new elements. While people retain pride in their ethnic backgrounds, they admit that they don't believe exactly the way their parents do. Many feel that their greater degree of acculturation makes them far more comfortable and effective on Kauai than their parents. And yet some wonder what they have lost.

People believe that the length of time an ethnic group has been on Kauai determines its influence and they point to Chinese financiers and professionals and Filipino plantation and kitchen workers as illustrations. They also note that social acceptance may relate to length of stay on Kauai. During the first year on a job, a newcomer may be regarded with suspicion. By the 3rd or 4th year, the person is an old-timer at work. Students five years ago expected teachers to change frequently. With the tightened job market, the teacher population is more stable.

The plantation system is resented by some people as representative of a discriminatory, outdated, favored-son attitude which still survives in most state and Kauai institutions. Others feel that the paternalistic attitude is useful to those arriving from places where the plantation system operates or to those who are unable or afraid to voice their attitudes.

Tourists come to Kauai as individuals but they constitute a group that is important in any new Kauai venture. Some Kauaians feel tourists are a large group whose tastes and needs as tourists are more predictable than are those of the ethnically varied citizens of Kauai. Others feel that options and opportunities are available to the tourists which are not offered to the citizens.

There is a growing feeling of regionalism, particularly among young people. They are interested in preserving sites of historical interest as well as saving the environment from what they have seen on Oahu. A larger percentage of students go to college on Kauai and in Hawaii than previously. More courses in multi-cultural communication, ethnic studies, and Pacific and Asian literature are being provided to help students search for their identities.

Going to the movies was once quite the social occasion on Kauai. One by one the theaters close. Those that remain open offer primarily martial arts thrillers, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, and B-movies. The Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino films are important cultural and social ties for many of the older immigrant citizens of Kauai. Although martial arts films attract many youngsters, the antiquated theaters, the lack of first-run movies, and the availability of television make movies less important on Kauai than they were twenty years ago.

Opportunities for immigrants and their children to identify both with the culture from which they came and with Kauai culture are available in such events as Miss Kauai Filipina, the Narcissus Festival, the Cherry Blossom Festival, Miss Koreana, Miss Puerto Rican, ball dances, Hanamatsuri, Flores de Mayo, and Chinese New Year.

The communication media have affected people's values. Because the mass media primarily express western values, they stress the competition on which western civilization depends. For example, television ads show young people "your own room," "your own phone," "your own car," "your own TV," whereas in cultures with extended families there is an emphasis on sharing.

Pidgin, which once varied according to the camp in which a speaker lived, now shows fewer variations. Some blame this on television; others feel it is an outcome of more widespread education. Students continue to say that pidgin is "bad" English, even though changes in linguistic attitudes have led to acceptance of pidgin by many teachers as a valid means of communication which may be more acceptable than standard English in certain places and occasions. More classes are being offered in which students examine the values implied by standard English and by pidgin, the structures of pidgin, and a comparison of Hawaiian pidgin with other pidgins.

Foxfire-type projects at several high schools and at the community college are stimulating encounters of young people with old-timers on Kauai. Initial contacts cause fears on the part of young people of being unable to understand the older citizens or of being unable to get them to talk about what life on Kauai was like in the past. The older citizens express fear of being recorded or photographed. Once dialogue begins, however, the young find much they want to learn. The old find joy that someone wants to know and record their skills, beliefs, and experiences.

The complexity of multiple backgrounds creates communication difficulties. The student from the Philippines comes from an autocratic society and often relates better to teachers than do many local Filipino students, but this same student may do very poorly in assimilating with his peer group. As a new immigrant, the

Filipino must adjust to messages which obviously place him at the bottom of Kauai's social structure. As he clings to other Filipinos in school and on social occasions out of fear, others feel he does not want to communicate or to join in and they tease or ignore him.

Not all negative messages come from outside groups. Young Filipinos who are second generation Hawaii Filipinos may be the most bitter toward new immigrants, teasing them with labels they know hurt--"PI" and "Blackie." Young people from the mainland may similarly speak with disparagement of mainland tourist stereotypes.

New immigrants from the Philippines may come from rural areas without sophisticated communication media. They become involved in absorbing the media, and it is very difficult for them to look at the ways in which media affect their lives. Students who come from Niihau find television a completely new and absorbing experience which greatly affects their conception of the world away from Niihau. Some of these newcomers are not all intrigued with the evidences of an impersonal world. Mainlanders, on the other hand, may find Kauai friendly and open or "too small and closed, just like the small town where I grew up."

Although Kauaians hear that the Japanese from Japan have marveled that Hawaiian Japanese are more traditionally Japanese and observe more of the customs than many families in Japan, older Kauaians worry about the loss of cultural identity in the process of adjusting to Kauai. Some feel this is necessary to acculturation and they cite examples of immigrants who reach out to absorb language and new ways and, because of this, are accepted as Kauaians and as members of their own ethnic groups. They would agree that, "The more you learn about other people and the American way of life, the more you don't want to return to the Philippines." Those immigrants who have adjusted urge others to build up their abilities rather than to dwell on their ethnic backgrounds.

Students don't seem to know quite what to do with the occasional Afro-American or Mexican-American. The ethnic materials used on the mainland are meaningless to them. Many refuse to identify with the Afro-American because they know how negatively he has been regarded. Many also have trouble identifying with the struggles of their own ethnic groups in Hawaii. They are far enough removed to feel detached from the struggles of these groups.

There are so many islands within this island. Stereotypes and lack of information are the seas which separate them.

Kauai is at the end of a communication whiplash. Kauaians watch the news on television and read news in the Honolulu papers. They receive information which is primarily about Oahu. As with the other outer islands, only occasionally are Kauai events deemed significant enough to appear in Honolulu programs and papers.

Because so much of television advertising is geared to the mainland and to Honolulu, Kauai viewers are isolated as "have-nots" whose standards are shaped by outside sources. They look to Oahu and the mainland for styles and products. Kauai's two radio stations and the Garden Island newspaper are the only local sources of programming and advertising. Many of Kauai's young people depend almost exclusively on these sources because they are the voice of a familiar world.

Dependent upon the tourist and outside developers, the Kauai economy needs those who come in from outside. Yet its citizens find these outside interests may change what Kauaians value about Kauai. Hearings of the Land Use Commission are fiery. People are identifying very strongly as Kauaians who do not want outsiders to come in and distort and destroy.

More services and products are offered by local stores. However, most people go to Honolulu for serious buying. Prices and choices are still more limited on Kauai.

Students find themselves working with encyclopedias and other research materials which exclude their state, their flora and fauna, their literature and history, and their ethnic backgrounds, except for limited materials developed in Hawaii. To catch the subtleties of television reference, or to have a well-developed base from which to attend college, they are expected to know the literary, social, and historical referents of mainland culture. Some are beginning to realize that because of these outside demands, much of their own culture has been devalued.

The available television programming exemplifies Americanism to many people. The violence and subject matter do not concern them. They feel it is the family responsibility to determine the uses of programs. They feel the options available with public television, educational television, and CABLE provide well-rounded viewing. They are concerned about who would pay for such non-discriminatory services as free CABLE for all.

Some people feel that many people, especially the newcomers, need to know where in the community to get information or services. They feel that the few notices that may appear in three languages are not sufficient. Others believe that such services are communicated adequately, but that people do not want to hear, do not listen, or are not concerned.

People on Kauai need opportunities to explore communication options. Living in a basically rural environment, they need to develop a concerned core of citizens which can press to develop that which Kauaians feel is positive about Kauai's communication styles. The development of such a group of people requires time for people to meet and develop awareness of issues, problems, rights, and possibilities of communication. Information and discussion can provide bases for making decisions about the use or rejection of technology which is now available.

Time is an imperative also for the interpersonal communication that most feel can develop understanding of ethnic qualities, cultural factors, and individual viewpoints. Kauai wants opportunities to meet, to make real contacts. People who do not respond to discussion of other communication issues become eloquent about the need for real contact with others.

Kauaians need to begin with their concern for interpersonal communication. Out of interpersonal issues can grow the needs and awareness from which citizen planning could help shape a Kauai whose communication styles serve its citizens.

COMMUNICATION AND CONFLICT

by Dana Bekeart

Can effective communication lessen social conflicts? You bet it can!

Does the lack of communication cause social problems? It sure does!

Our State of Hawaii has the worldwide reputation of being the socio-cultural "melting pot of the Pacific." And for very good reasons: It is difficult to imagine any other small land area which maintains such a concentrated population composed of similar numbers of Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos and Caucasians; there are, additionally, significant numbers of people in small ethnic groups (native Hawaiian, Korean, Portuguese, Puerto Rican, Black, etc.).

We are fortunate that a unique pluralistic society exists in our own backyard which is, as it were, a microcosmic model of the macrocosmic, global society of man. Hawaii, then, presents us with both a vital social laboratory for study and a glimpse of our global future.

The issues central to the "Right to Communicate" Program deal directly with the repeated efforts to solve human social conflicts. In Hawaii, as it is throughout many parts of the world, conflict between different ethnic peoples is a pressing and debilitating social fact. A social problem is necessarily bound up in a shared recognition of the problem.

If two antagonistic ethnic groups do not both perceive a problem together, then the problem stands little chance of being remedied. It is through a common awareness and communication of the definition of a problem that enables those involved to solve conflicts. If an aware group has a feeble (or no) ability to communicate, then others will not respond in helping to solve common social problems. As an example of this "common awareness--communication" relationship, the coal miners of America could not develop an effective program to combat "Black Lung" disease because they could not communicate to others (until recently) some understanding about this dread ailment. Conversely, once the miners were successful in communicating their perception of the problem to involved groups and federal agencies, and once these groups also became aware of the problem, then, and only then, has there been a concerted effort to end this terrible situation. So, it is through communication (and a shared awareness) that solutions to social problems can be achieved.

Education in inter-cultural and intra-cultural communication is intended to lessen the unnecessary, destructive and complex gaps which usually persist between any two distinct cultures. The enduring problems of racial and ethnic prejudice, ignorance and fear of another cultural group, and the failure to appreciate another culture's positive accomplishments and contributions are just a few of the important social obstacles that need to be overcome. The "Right to Communicate" should recognize such difficulties and help in working toward their solution.

Members of any culture have defense cues built into their language (and associated behavior). A slight pause in conversation, the lowering of voices, superficial courtesy, and a narrowing of conversational topics all serve as signals for alertness and defense towards any stranger(s) entering into contact with the dominant group. No wonder, then, that the newcomer(s) feels "put off." On Kauai, pidgin english (as a creole dialect), immediately delineates an ethnic boundary. The drawing of this invisible line, and informing others of this line, leads to a restriction of communication between different ethnic groups. Any newcomer to a different ethnic group finds that assimilating into the local dialect is particularly difficult. It may take a decade for a person to feel comfortable with local pidgin, for example.

The gap is especially wide during the high school years in Hawaii. "Locals" are often suspicious of newcomers because the newcomer's speech just doesn't fit in; thus the point of snubbing and ridicule is often reached. Open antagonism and violence are then close at hand. In-group identities define ethnic boundaries; local pidgin speakers exercise in-group control by requiring that pidgin be spoken exclusively. Any person who doesn't present the appropriate "communication credentials" will not be heard out. Individuals in the group risk ridicule themselves if they revert to other inappropriate speech idioms. (Others will say, "Eh, no act!") There is a subtle but potent ad hominem thinking running through the in-group attitude towards the stranger--his language is different, his ways are different, so he and his ideas are intolerable. The gap is sharpened and widened, partly because two-way communication cannot even be initiated; communication requires that a common, open ground of acknowledgment be maintained.

How is the outsider to bridge the gap (especially the spoken communications gap)? The newcomer must begin as an infant: through trial and error--the faux pas--one can learn from his/her mistakes. Then communication in another culture becomes a definite possibility. An outsider who gamely struggles to adapt to the novel cultural communication conditions will be rewarded tenfold for these struggles. There is an obvious need (on Kauai as elsewhere) to ease the entry of the stranger into the kind of life (and the unique ways of communicating) that local people enjoy. Language is a carrier of culture; on multi-cultural Kauai, communication is thus more difficult to accomplish.

If, for example, a newly arrived Ilokano youth can readily join into a local youth's commonly shareable appreciation of automobiles, then (from this common ground and rudimentary communication), the acceptance and sharing of a wider range of ideas unfolds with unusual ease. This then opens the door to a more general appreciation and acceptance of each others' total life style.

For Kauai's young, there are not enough opportunities to accept and share ethnic values and ideas because of the lack of available grounds for overlapping "universes of discourse." Kauai is not unique in the lack of this opportunity: even though Black and White sharecroppers in the South had common experiences and needs, they could not accept each other as they were; prejudice ran high because each could not recognize in the other what was common and valuable to both.

Efforts to prepare persons for entry into another culture can be successful. The Peace Corps has trained its volunteers in prerequisites for a more successful

entrance into another culture. The volunteer may not utilize his training, or the culture may not accept his attempts. The latter case illustrates that communication is indeed a two-way street: the host culture must take the patient steps towards acceptance; they must concede a newcomer's right to make mistakes, give credit for his/her attempts, and acknowledge the right to communicate.

Unfortunately, "ethnic studies" courses in our public schools are at a stage of neglected infancy. Yet, basic education in other cultures, both in those found locally as well as others, would lessen the ignorance which breeds prejudice. Language education might be an excellent way to approach this educational insufficiency. Our discussion group members quickly agreed that it is folly to require our students to become knowledgeable in the European romance languages while neglecting to provide them with foreign language opportunities that are relevant--Japanese, Chinese, pidgin (?), Ilokano--to our special island situation.

Our people need to be exposed positively and intelligently to each others' cultures. With this exposure--even minimally--open contact and friendship will have a chance to develop. Effective communication is the necessary (but not sufficient) condition for both inter-cultural and inter-personal appreciation.

Every culture contains a complex set of values which encourage and/or forbid certain behaviors of its members. Interpersonal communication within a culture serves the purpose of conveying their values to one another. Individual conduct is controlled and modified through the means of communication. Some values are common to two (or more) distinct cultures. For example, Americans and English share an appreciation and protection of the right of an individual to "speak his/her mind." Effective inter-cultural communication must, therefore, carry and integrate inter-cultural values.

The "Right to Communicate" program must also recognize and support the means by which cultural values may be exchanged. There should be a "moral (v.v. values) dimension" in the articulation of this important right. Without this "value component," the "Right to Communicate" will fall short of its noble purposes. Social conflict can develop as a result of the failure to provide for a common ground for the sharing of values. The participants in the Kauai workshop were able to openly express and share each others' values and concerns about inter-cultural communication. This workshop has set a stage for solving the issues and concerns that were expressed by its participants; hopefully, the "Right to Communicate" will take the desired steps towards lessening these expressed social frictions.

Can effective communication lessen social conflicts? You bet!!

DISCUSSION

The three papers by Bulatao, Sina and Beckeart include most of the comments that appear in the notes of the rapporteurs for the dialog groups.

One point of agreement at the end of the evening has major implications for communication policy and should be stressed here. A strong preference was expressed

for a style of communication that emphasized a value of harmony rather than confrontation, and cooperation rather than competition in day-to-day communication activities. A preference was also expressed for dialog, for the give-and-take of conversation as contrasted with formal, one-way communication. It might be added that the participants who convened in the Parish Hall demonstrated in their own behavior the values concerning that harmony which they believed ought to guide the formation of communication policy.

A comment by one participant expressed the attitude of most participants: "Very good. Let's have more workshops like this."

OAHU DIALOG

KEY PERSONS, ORGANIZATIONS AND POLICY ISSUES

Island Sponsor: Honolulu Community-Media Council

Date and Place: Friday, March 11, 9:30 a.m. - 2 p.m. Honolulu YWCA

Island Coordinator: Ms. Ah Jook Ku

Participating Organizations: YWCA

Common Cause

Oahu Council of Presidents

Academic Humanists:

Dr. Charles J. Lees, President, Chaminade College

Dr. Richard Miller, Law, University of Hawaii at
Manoa

Dr. Dennis Ogawa, American Studies, University of
Hawaii at Manoa

Resource Persons and
Rapporteurs:

Mr. Glen Grant

Mr. Mike Middlesworth

Mr. Stephen Okamura

Mr. George Omen

Rev. Olin Pendleton

Ms. Edith Webster

Policy Issues: How can community groups and individuals gain access to the news media? How can better balance be achieved concerning community news in the media?

How effective is the "Sunshine Law" in opening up the processes of government to the community? What are the exceptions to openness, for the sake of privacy?

How can a community like Honolulu maintain its cultural diversity and pluralism through development of communication rights? Reading and writing skills seem basic to communication rights broadly enjoyed in community.

INTRODUCTION

The Oahu dialog developed out of the particular interests on the island and from those concerns expressed by the participating and sponsoring organizations. Great interest in the "Sunshine Law," for example, was immediately apparent from not only the Honolulu Community-Media Council but also from Common Cause--both groups had actively sought passage of the law for two sessions of the Legislature. Another cluster of concerns grew out of the YWCA and other organizations' feeling that certain groups in the community were not adequately represented in the press, that their views were not equitably presented. Another cause of anxiety was over access to the news media by a wide range of organizations, to get their messages across to the larger community. With this was the related concern that people have a right to be left alone, a right to privacy, and that this is sometimes caught up in reporting by the news media. Other early concerns were over whether community participation in the communication process could be adequate without basic communication skills being acquired by students in the school system. More broadly, an understanding of the community decision-making process was considered important if the right to communicate was to have significant meaning.

The dialog session was shaped by these interests and the special experience and knowledge of the academic humanists--chosen for their expertise in policy ethics, law and cultural concerns. Ethics to Dr. Lees, for example, meant going deeply into the fundamental questions of how man developed his sense of right and wrong. To Dr. Miller, discussion of the law meant going to not only the law on the books but how it operates in practice, and where communication and education fit in. For Dr. Ogawa, cultural concerns in Hawaii meant a balancing of plurality with harmony to get along in community with each other--sometimes the pull of ethnicity endangered seriously the harmony of the whole community.

It soon was very clear the academic-humanists didn't come with easy answers--they came with hard questions.

Max Roffman, chairman of the Honolulu Community-Media Council, set the context for the meeting in a provocative manner. He started by noting he felt everyone was for the right to communicate, so what was there to talk about. He ended his short talk, however, by wondering whether the task was too immense for the group, and he suggested that perhaps we should all go home. In between, he noted that rights bear responsibilities, and that often one right may collide with another. "The right to communicate," he told the group, "sometimes collides with the right to privacy."

Roffman also noted that the right to communicate is not equal for all, and that there can be abuses of the right. He also asked "of what value is the right to communicate to one who lacks the skill of reading, of speaking intelligently, or of writing?"

Oahu differs in many obvious ways from the sites of the other Right to Communicate dialogs, and these factors were shaping. All of the principal news media are centralized on Oahu--in Honolulu itself, within a few miles of each other. There is a strong outward flow of mass communication but not as much coming back. Also, Oahu is the business, political, cultural, educational and

just about every other center for the State. Its population far exceeds that of the rest of the state. It has a wide diversity of social, cultural and economic groupings. Organizations abound, both professional and community. Mass media communication is an accepted part of the environment.

It was with this background that the Right to Communicate dialog took place on Oahu.

Each of the humanists brought special perspectives to the dialog, focusing on the discussion group topics of policy ethics, positive law and cultural values, and how the topics relate to communication and public policy. All three stressed the need for education--to develop consciousness, to understand the legal environment, and to communicate cross-culturally.

Dr. Lees' paper quotes Richard Hooker as a basis for a discussion of the freedom to communication, the right to do so, but the need to do "no violence" to an individual's conscience. The paper brings modern situations, such as Jerry Rubin and the "Chicago Seven," and the withholding of information from the public, and notes the necessity of a "well-formed" conscience. Hooker, Lees noted, reaffirms "that education is an a priori necessity for communication." Lees said it is not legal codes that determine ethics in communication, but "the wisdom of human being welded together in a society that admits the rights of God and man . . ."

Dr. Miller starts by noting that the right to communicate alone "does not provide assurance of effective communication." He said just knowing about government is not enough to effectively participate--power is of supreme importance. Knowledge is a necessary precondition, however, for the exercise of power. To help the public communicate with the decision-makers, there should be "available to all citizens a fundamental understanding of the legal environment," or how things are done. For a right to communicate to achieve full recognition, the public needs more specialized understanding of the law, and particularly communication law. It is basically an educational task, he said. Dr. Miller also noted that the adversary system of law is a communication mode with a skilled, expert spokesman to stand for the rights of others not so well informed of the law.

Dr. Ogawa started by saying that in Hawaii "the 'right to communicate' rapidly transforms into a question of the 'ability to communicate' in a multi-cultural society." Rights are the legal potential; abilities are being able to communicate cross-culturally. Developing this ability to communicate cross-culturally--not suppressing other cultural communication modes--is a complex task. Ogawa rejects cultural uniformity or isolation, and said cultural values and institutions will have to be restructured to encourage this ability to communicate cross-culturally, thereby permitting maintenance of one's particular cultural values while making possible participation in the wider society on an equitable basis. Community institutions must open themselves to wider cultural inputs, and thereby extend "rights to communication."

ETHICAL CONSIDERATION CONCERNING THE RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE

by Charles J. Lees, Ph.D.

In his preface to The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, the famous Protestant theologian, Richard Hooker, who lived from 1556 to 1600, states:

"The first mean whereby Nature teaches men to judge good from evil, as well as in laws as in other things, is the force of their own discretion. Hereunto therefore Saint Paul referreth oftentimes his own speech to be considered by them that heard him, 'I speak as to them which have understanding: judge ye what I say.' Again, afterward, 'Judge in yourselves, it is comely that a woman pray uncovered?' The exercise of this kind of judgment our Savior requireth in the Jews. In them of Berea, the Scripture commendeth it. Finally, whatever we do, if our own secret consent not unto it as good and fit to be done, the doing of it, to us is sin, although the thing of itself be allowable. Saint Paul's rule therefore generally is 'Let every man in his own mind be fully persuaded of that thing which he either alloweth or doth.'"

Hooker seems to embrace in one sweeping paragraph both the freedom to communicate and the right to do so, provided one does no violence to his conscience, by which term is meant fidelity to reason and the manifestation of it. Theoretically speaking, this philosophic premise seems clear and understandable; but, in actuality, the principle has been practiced and violated with equal frequency.

Conscience is no easy taskmaster. It never was. In Hooker's own epoch, Sir Thomas More, a man who simply wanted to be left alone in his silent dissent, was beheaded for not verbalizing externally what the King of England insisted on hearing. Or witness the case of the obstinate John Stubbs, who, by royal command, had his right hand chopped off for writing against Queen Elizabeth I's contemplated marriage to a Frenchman.

In a pluralistic society such as our own, the problems attendant upon Hooker's carefully delineated position are neither fewer in number nor less serious in drastic consequences. For example, Jerry Rubin, one of the "Chicago Seven" defendants, emphasized that he was "guilty as hell" of conspiring to incite riots during the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago but he was not "wrong." Again, the Supreme Court left intact a lower court ruling that followers of a religious sect in the hills of Tennessee have no constitutional right to handle poisonous snakes or drink strychnine at worship services, despite the fact that the sect was inspired by Jesus' pledge that His followers "shall take up serpents" and "if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not harm them." One might say that the verbal exercise of one's conscientious right is complicated by another person's exercising his conscientious right.

The matter becomes still more intricate when governmental or other organizations exercise the right to withhold information for the sake of the common good, when information is "classified," when, in the words of the Senate Search Committee on Intelligence, secret operations are made "to expose, disrupt,

misdirect and otherwise neutralize" the activities of an individual like Martin Luther King, Jr., or a group like the Klu Klux Klan, thus depriving one of his right to know and, in consequence, the exercise of his responsibility to speak up.

Hooker comments further that: "Some things are so familiar and plain that truth from falsehood and good from evil is most easily discerned in them, even by men of no deep capacity." A mugging in New York's Central Park, for example, is acknowledged at once to be reprehensible. It requires a little more subtlety to judge the justice of Elizabethan laws which punished begging--in a time of high unemployment; which sentenced a man to death for stealing a loaf of bread--even though the man was starving; or, in more modern times, laws which permit abortion--even though the foetus is alive and well. Essentially, is not Hooker postulating the necessity of a well-formed conscience or, in other words, the necessity of an educated awareness in order to cope with a matter which one either chooses to address or, indeed, must address.

Richard Hooker affirms: "In the doubtful cases of law, what man is there who seeth not how requisite it is that professors of skill in that faculty be our director."

Is Hooker not emphasizing that education is a sine qua non for communicating? That there is a need for education to ascertain the facts in any given situation? That there is a need to know before a judgment can be made? That monopolies of educational media prevent the verifying of facts? That people cannot communicate from a position of ignorance?

Hooker's preface continues: "Let the vulgar sort among you know that there is not the least branch of the cause wherein they are so resolute but to the truth of it a great deal more appertaineth than their concept doth reach unto."

Is Hooker not reaffirming that education is an a priori necessity for communication, an education that promotes research; that indicates one's limitations; that prompts valid conclusions based upon honest premises; that neither understates or overestimates the complexities of any problem; that demands scholarly humility based on openness of mind and accessibility to information?

Long before President Lyndon Johnson's suggestion, to reason together, the age of Hooker spoke of "sweet reasonableness." This "sweet reasonableness" is more necessary than ever in an era where problems are more complex but also where technology has developed communication to such an extent that it can give birth to a Frankenstein horror or to a world of "sunshine."

When all is said and done, it will not be any legal code which determines the ethics of communicating. It will be the wisdom of human beings welded together in a society that admits the rights of God and man; a society that admits not only rights but also responsibilities; that honors the rights of others; that respects minorities and their frustrations, the poor and their wants, the young and their insights, and the old and their experience. If Pius XII, speaking of his own time, declared that its greatest evil was lying, would it not be possible through good will and concerted effort, for future historians to say of our own generation that it commenced an era of honor, openness, mutual respect, a sharing of minds--all bespeaking that we are all brothers and that, indeed, we are our brothers' keeper?

THE RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE WHAT? - A DISCUSSION OF THE NEED FOR
MORE INFORMATION ABOUT LAW TO PROMOTE EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION

by Richard S. Miller

I.

Public access to modes of communication can, and does, serve virtually every important human value. Obviously, however, the utility of communication, for whatever purpose, is enhanced by knowledge possessed by the communicator and the recipients. Thus, for example, transnational communication may only become useful when adequate language skills are possessed by the participants; the effective transmission of medical information requires adequate medical knowledge at both ends of the communication channel; and even communication for purposes of entertainment may require the entertainer and the listener or watcher to share at least some common values and knowledge. It would seem to follow, therefore, that the existence of a right to communicate, along, does not provide assurance of effective communication.

Nowhere is the deficiency of communication without knowledge more apparent than in the area of public participation in governmental decision-making processes. We are here referring to the value which is of supreme importance in a democratic society--power. As Harold Lasswell has pointed out, intelligence gathering and dissemination is itself a decision-making function. He who controls the intelligence function, or who participates in its performance, possesses power--power which may be used to bring about desired decisions. But Lasswell also distinguished the performance of the intelligence function from the values which are necessary to make the performance of that function effective. Foremost among those values, for our purposes, is enlightenment, or knowledge. Decisions may be affected by persons with wealth, position and skill, but enlightenment, in a democratic society, is arguably the primary "scope" value for effective participation in the intelligence function and other critical decision functions. In short, knowledge is a necessary pre-condition to effective communication in the realm of public decision-making.

A particular kind of knowledge is called for, however: Knowledge of the intricacies of the decision-making system (the Constitutive process), the rules, principles and policies which guide the system, and the details of the particular issue are all necessary for effective communication about public decision-making. Although the leadership of mainland China may be trying, and perhaps succeeding, in inculcating each citizen with adequate knowledge of the rules and the intricacies of the society and its decisional processes, such information in democratic societies has more and more come to be the exclusive domain of the lawyers and civil servants. Thus, the manner in which decisions are made by official decision-makers (procedure and process) as well as the meaning and details of the decisions authoritatively made (substantive law), more and more become the lawyer's (and civil servant's) "deep, dark secret." Is it any wonder, therefore, that lawyers tend to monopolize public decision-making, while the general public, in spite of relatively free and easy access to decision-makers is frustrated at its inability to communicate its needs and desires effectively?

The increased complexity of decisions has, of course, compounded the problem. Whether the problem is as broad as energy shortages, inflation, unemployment or rising medical costs, or as narrow as control of gasoline prices, minimum wages, unemployment compensation restrictions or medical malpractice, there is an overlay of complex constitutional, statutory, administrative and decisional laws which, when combined with the quantity and intricacy of the statistics and facts which surround the problem, make public comprehension (and sometimes comprehension by the decision-makers themselves) virtually impossible. While there may be little that can be done to simplify the factual aspects of such problems, a first step toward effective communication from and to the public with respect to complex issues would be to make available to all citizens a fundamental understanding of the legal environment--its processes, its rules and principles, and its policies. Those who possessed such understanding would then at least start off with a common basis upon which to communicate among themselves and with decision-makers with respect to such issues.

II.

It is scarcely possible to enslave a Republic where the Body of the People are well instructed in their Law, Rights and Liberties.

Ezra Stiles, 1777

As the quotation from Ezra Stiles suggests, there are other, more pressing reasons--especially today in the wake of Watergate--to provide enlightenment about law and the legal system to "the Body of the People" than just abstractly to improve the effectiveness of the "right to communicate." The payoff will be protective--to insure against deprivation of fundamental rights--as well as promotive of the will and welfare of the people as they are affected by public decisions about societal problems.

The question remains, however, as to how best to provide such enlightenment to the body politic and in what form and dimension. The remainder of this paper will address these questions.

A. Decision-Making Processes

The naive assumption that rules of law once adopted are automatically implemented is widely held. A more basic source of public naivete is the simplistic view that the four branches of government each performs only the functions for which they are specialized, *i.e.*, that legislatures only make law, the executive only executes law, administrative agencies only administer law and judges only apply it. The fact is, however, that there are at least seven important decision-making functions--intelligence, promotion, invoking, applying, prescribing, appraising and terminating--and that each public agency, along with private individuals and groups, performs them all in a variety of contexts, by a variety of means with a wide variety of effects. If the people are to be "well instructed in their Law, Rights and Liberties," therefore, it would seem to follow that they should first--or at least concurrently--be well instructed in the processes by which these laws, rights and liberties are brought into life and given effect.

Such instruction ought to include not merely the study of the "formal" decision-making system and its authoritative structure, but the realities of decision-making, as well. Put another way, the study has to be of the "operational code"--how decisions are really made--as well as the "myth system"--widely held but frequently erroneous beliefs about the rules which govern decision-making.

More specifically, the topics to be included under decision-making processes would include:

1. The Constitutive Process--Who, in the society, is authorized by the federal and state constitutions to perform the various decision functions? Who in fact performs them? What procedures are followed in their performance? This topic would include examination of the "separation of powers" and the realities of decision-making. It would explore the sources of law and policy, and would locate and describe the specific formal and informal procedures followed in the making, invoking, applying, appraising and terminating of law and policy. Specific subjects included here would be:
 - a. Decision-making authority under state and federal constitutions.
 - b. Separation of powers.
 - c. The adversary system in the courts. Criminal and civil procedure.
 - d. The appellate courts. The nature of the judicial process.
 - e. Legislative decision-making, including prescribing of law and policy, legislative oversight, legislative investigations.
 - f. Administrative agencies. Rule making. Quasi-judicial decision-making.
 - g. Executive powers.
 - h. Decision-making by non-official bodies--labor unions, corporations, powerful individuals, etc., etc. Public administration.
 - i. Judicial review of legislative, executive, judicial and administrative decisions.
2. Constraints upon the Constitutive Process--What constitutional and other constraints are imposed on decision-making? To what extent are formal constraints effectively applied? Included here would be:
 - a. Discretionary justice.
 - b. Requirements of Due Process of Law and Equal Protection. State action.
 - c. Rules of evidence and their application.
 - d. Freedom of Information laws.
 - e. Sunshine laws.
 - f. "Standing to sue," "class action" rules and other constraints upon access to courts and other decisional bodies.
 - g. Registration of lobbyists.
 - h. Campaign spending laws and other rules governing the electoral process.

B. Political and Civil Rights

Following, or concurrently with, study of the "constitutive process," understanding of basic political and civil rights which cut across all areas of

law should be provided. Of course, specific constitutional rights, such as Due Process and certain First Amendment rights, will have been introduced in connection with study of the decision-making processes themselves. Nevertheless, the scope and purpose of these rights should be examined in connection with the wide variety of other contexts in which they can arise. Specific subjects will include:

1. First Amendment rights--Freedom of speech and religion; the right to petition for redress of grievances, freedom of assembly, association, and travel, etc., etc.
2. Constitutional Rights applicable to the criminal justice system--Here, the various rights set forth in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and eighth amendments would be examined. Quite properly, study of these rights might be included in a broader examination of the entire criminal justice system which would include exploration of the substantive elements of the criminal law, as well as the policy foundations and reasoning on which they are based.
3. Political Rights--Voting rights, constitutional and statutory; rights of access to the political process, etc. Such rights may first be introduced in connection with examination of the "Constitutive Process," but might later be subject to expanded exploration as a separate topic.
4. Civil rights--Constitutional and statutory protections against discrimination; equal protection; privileges and immunities. Here constitutional rights provided by the 13th and 14th amendments, as well as implementing legislation, should be included. The proposed equal rights amendment might also be included here.

C. Laws Relating to Specific Substantive Areas

Once the public develops an understanding of the basic constitutive process and their political and civil rights, laws relating to specific subject areas may be introduced for study. The logic of waiting until basic understanding of process and basic rights is produced until introducing specific substantive topics is not inexorable, but is premised on the view that the effect and effectiveness of legal rights cannot be fully understood until one comprehends the workings of the system itself. Thus, for example, the right to recover damages for breach of a contract is of little value if the economics of the practice of law preclude an attorney from taking the case (and legal aid is unavailable) or if there is some other defect in the system, such as bias, which precludes recovery.

Specific subject areas would include, among other things:

1. Health and accident law.
2. Employment law.
3. Housing law.
4. Business law.

5. Consumer protection law.
6. Poverty law.
7. International law and relations.

In addition, specific problem areas which might cut across several different areas of law might be usefully explored from time to time, particularly as they receive publicity and intrude on the public consciousness. Examples of such problem areas include the medical malpractice crisis, no-fault auto insurance, election reform, particular environmental issues, etc., etc.

D. Law Relating to the Right to Communicate

If the Right to Communicate is to achieve fullest recognition, it will be useful to provide the public with more specialized understanding of the relevant law than will be provided by study of areas earlier mentioned. That is, communications law is a specialty of its own. While it is affected in major ways by the First Amendment, by Sunshine Laws, etc., it also encompasses federal regulation of the communications industry and electronic communication. Specific treatment of such subjects, which would provide the public with knowledge of the rights provided the public by such laws, suggest the means by which they can be given effect, and would educate segments of the public as to possible deficiencies and needed areas of improvement, would seem warranted.

III.

IMPLEMENTATION

Educating the public with respect to the matters discussed here itself involves a massive task of communication. Essentially, of course, the problem is one of education--education in the elementary and secondary schools, continuing adult education, and public education through the media. Traditionally, the study of law has been left to the lawyers. Increasingly, however, both the legal profession (since Leon Jaworski's stewardship of the American Bar Association) and the education profession have come to recognize the importance of citizenship education in the law, and efforts toward such an end, including funding, have been undertaken across the United States.

The difficulty of the task is compounded by the fact that it may be too important to be left to the lawyers. A realistic understanding of decision-making processes and the conceptual foundations of law must come from an association of educators, political scientists and lawyers. The program of education must start in the early grades, must have adequate materials, and must take an incremental approach if citizens are to arrive at maturity with the requisite understanding to comprehend public issues and to communicate effectively about them.

COMMUNICATING IN A PLURALISTIC COMMUNITY

by Dennis Ogawa and Glen Grant

The "right to communicate" is a social, legal issue integral to a democratic society's open decision-making processes. "Open covenants, openly arrived at" has become, therefore, the lyric of the new Watchman Citizenry cautious of cabal politics. Without open communication between the government and the public, without insurance that channels of communication are protected from unwarranted or arbitrary intrusions of bureaucratic abuse, without expanding the accessibility of communication channels to an otherwise disenfranchised or apathetic populace, the adhesive of a democratic way of life dissolves. For the protection of the individual's right to know and to be heard is the foundation of social justice.

But even as the "right to communicate" is strengthened through various legal actions and humanist dialogues, Americans increasingly become sensitive to the fact that their society is not only largely democratic but pluralistic. That we are a "nation of immigrants," of native and sojourner, is an indisputable sociological reality. And in this heterogeneity of American society, especially symbolized in the island community of Hawaii, resides both the potential energy and impotencies of multi-cultural systems. On the one hand Americans can draw from their rich ethnic heritages the personal alternatives necessary to cope with current social and psychological pressures. "Ethnic identity" can be a meaningful salve for social alienation and disorientation. But their cultural diversities can also exacerbate the jealousies, the hatreds springing from a primordial fear of the "other," the "different." As Americans take growing pride in their varying cultural idiosyncrasies, the lesson from Babel appears all too ominously. To what extent can a people speak different tongues, worship different gods, pursue different dreams and still find that they have an ability to share a common knowledge harmoniously? The "right to communicate" rapidly transforms into a question of the "ability to communicate" in a multi-cultural society. "Rights" imply the legal potential for action in an open society--"abilities" imply developing social environments where ideas, wants and desires can be coherently expressed in a cross-cultural context.

Developing an "ability to communicate" in a pluralistic society devolves first upon exploring the cultural imperative in human interaction. No universal language, no universal value or conception of reality naturally binds the citizenry of a heterogeneous community to a universal meaning. To the contrary, varying cultural values, beliefs and customs, differentiating ethnic groups and individuals, seem the resilient human proclivity. As much as we would like to think of different cultural groups as being "brothers and sisters under the skin," such a well-intentioned reverie dangerously ignores the diversity, no conformity, endemic to the human condition. Experience, after all, reveals that the behaviors of various peoples are indeed different. Their notions about the content of "communication," "discussion," "giving their two cents worth and being heard," are as multifarious as their more ethereal "world views." As Edward Hall in The Silent Language has so perceptively demonstrated, we individually possess a body language, a style of communication dependent on several cultural variables. Indeed,

the cultural imperative in communication defines the "nature of the givens" not as a one-way communicative avenue, but a complex radial grid of multi-dimensional cues and messages.

An example of how the cultural imperative affects communication is found in the multi-cultural setting of the Hawaiian classroom. A frequent stereotypic complain of teachers at both the college and public school level revolves around the problem of communication in classroom discussions. Japanese students are too quiet--Haole students are too boisterous--Hawaiian students are too passive. Useful communication is frequently impossible. Of course each from their own perspective are "communicating" in ways culturally condoned in the home, among their peers or according to their "world view." But their mutually exclusive notions of "how to behave properly" have little if any common ground upon which students and teachers can effectively exchange ideas. Such a condition of communication in the pluralistic setting does not lead naturally to mutual understanding across the gulf of cultural imperatives.

In the race conscious 1970's the recognition of cultural differences between ethnic groups is becoming an everyday perception and problem. It has become gauche to suggest that in reality "we are all Americans," or "cut from the same cloth." Bilingualism and ethnic heritage units in the schools, Black, Yellow, Brown and Red power political movements have repeatedly proselytized the need and pride in being different. "Culture," "ethnicity," "culture shock," "cross-cultural communication" have become almost overused terms describing the American Dilemma. Hardly a magazine is published, a college course taught or a humanist symposium conducted that some aspect of ethnicity isn't included as a testament to our enrapture with cultural imperatives. Americans are straining to discover the intrinsic individualities that separate them--and struggling to uncover the means to facilitate communicating beyond those differences. In doing so, though, the dialogue must go beyond anthropological issues of how many colors Japanese, Polynesians, Filipinos or Caucasians see in the rainbow or speculative questions of what the American Black, Australian aborigine or Mohawk really means when they say "communicate." Questions dealing with the implications of institutionalized cultural suppression must also be raised if the "ability to communicate" is to be thoroughly developed. For the cultural imperative can become systematically incorporated into daily patterns of life resulting in several forms of subtle social suppression. Cultural values intertwined with economic, educational or political institutions result in the divestment of certain groups' "rights" and "abilities" to communicate.

This invidious dimension of the American Dilemma must be understood as based not only on the territorial and monetary imperative of political and economic systems but on specific cultural imperatives continually defining "good" behaviors and values. Those ethnic groups who view these same values and behaviors as "good" assimilate into social, financial and political power--they come to possess the "rights" and "abilities" of communication. Those who pursue other cultural "goods" not conducive to American institutions, those whose cultural maze way conflicts with the dominant culture's maze way, fall to the wayside--unemployed, in many cases unemployable, without educational, political or financial access to any of the "open" channels of communication. They become the "culturally deprived," a dehumanizing euphemism implying a people who have no culture.

The imperilment of certain ethnic groups' "ability to communicate" can again be illustrated in the Hawaiian classroom. The institutional setting of the classroom naturally expects and demands certain types of communicative and learning behaviors so as to meet certain cultural assumptions. The system expects the students to become aggressive, competitive and verbally outspoken--behaviors essential to perpetuate an assumptive American self-image. Many non-white students demanded to compete in such a manner view this style of communication as being "haolified," a pejorative term indicating behavior unapproved by their peers. Consequently, the environment of the student outside of the classroom reinforces behaviors incompatible with the culture of the school. Without the necessary incentive to engage in "haolified" behaviors, and punished by his peers and home if he should, many local students refrain from participating in class. So doing, they abdicate any access to classroom rewards, accentuating their own sense of failure as well as reinforcing the system's treatment of them as "deprived," "retarded" or "non-achieving." While certainly a highly generalized paradigm, this educational problem has implications for the institutional dimension of the cultural imperative, and its resulting influence on communication. A cycle of failure, resentment and more failure is perpetuated through an inability to openly and reciprocally communicate in a cross-cultural institution.

This classroom situation also has a parallel in the greater social arena. After all, children do eventually matriculate into adulthood, carrying with them the tools or maladjustments of their adolescent education. As would be true of Blacks or Chicanos on the mainland, the Hawaiian, for example, finds that in Hawaii a cultural imperative has been institutionalized to impede his social mobility and well-being. Although the oldest ethnic group in residence, the Hawaiian repeatedly appears on the lower curves of the education, economic and mobility statistical graphs. Aggressive competition eroding coherent family structures, a sacrifice of affiliative friendships for material achievements have long been recognized as the price the native Hawaiian has had to pay for the "tragedy of assimilation." Those who do pay the price have frequently found later that the cost to ethnic pride and dignity was perhaps too great.

This dilemma that the institutionalized cultural imperative poses to a pluralistic community can be perplexing. The cultural "outsider" wants a greater share of the power distribution in society while at the same time maintaining a distinct cultural integrity and ethnic identity. The cultural "insider," naturally desiring to retain their beneficial social position, assume that "one culture" for any system is entirely enough and that the "outsider" should strive to become the "same" as everyone else. Derived from these both self-aggrandizing attitudes have emerged certain remedial alternatives hoping to redefine "ethnicity" in modern America.

The first, historically-tested solution, is to return to a single notion of culture, conducive to American institutions and imposed upon diverse people. Uniformity, not diversity, is the only way in which to cope with a system comprised of over two hundred million Americans. The centrifugal impulse pulling people apart, however, seems to mitigate against such a return to extensive Americanization campaigns--the insidious effects of cultural imposition have been reviled by the bitterness and frustrations of the immigrant generations. The second, currently more chic solution, is to return to some nostalgic notion of culture before

assimilation and American competition inflicted their damage on agrarian or native peoples. As tempting as the myth of the return to a golden age might be, it negates the harder bread-and-butter issues. Encouraging children to isolate themselves in a Cultural Oz ill-prepares them for the type of technological society in which the future will unfold. There are certain intuitive meanings irreplaceable in the hula, the tea-ceremony, the yamulka and the shillelagh. But those ephemeral symbols alone cannot replace the payroll check, provide literacy or satisfy the needs of the dinner table. Other social tools not supplied by "ethnic heritage" are prerequisite to survival. The withdrawal into cultural isolation for most ethnic groups will eventually mean that they become atavistic museum pieces wholly supported through the munificence of a patron.

The pendulum usually finds its repose in the balance of forces. The educator, the humanist, the social scientist, the parent and the layman will most likely find agreement that the first two alternatives are both undesirable and unacceptable. The first degrades the individual by attempting to tamper with his cultural integrity, by turning him into something he is not. The second equally degrades the human being by depriving him of the technological and economic autonomy necessary for full democratic participation in society--it relegates him to a paternalistic role in a static world. And both, by either a denial or overemphasis on ethnicity do not suggest solutions to the greater problem--how harmony in pluralism can be achieved with a maximum allowance for cultural diversity.

More plausibly, the solution to reconciling institutionalized cultural imperatives with wider social participation will necessitate both a restructuring of various cultural values and institutions so as to diffuse the ability of individuals to maximize their communication potentials. First the cultural "outsider," if he chooses greater social equality, must recognize that culture is not static but dynamic. "Ethnicity" to be viable cannot be a concept which clings to a past era, but must supply individuals with useful tools and knowledge. Behaviors or cultural responses which become archaic, losing any relevant sociological or psychological function, can be supplemented by new behaviors without a necessary loss of "ethnic integrity"--assimilation in a responsible and constructive manner, not coerced under an atmosphere of "inferior," need not always be a "tragedy." The issue of "pidgin" English usage in Hawaii is a useful illustration of how cultural expansion can enhance one's ability to communicate. Only the most irresponsible would argue that for Island children "pidgin" English could become the exclusive lingua franca. While in certain contexts, "pidgin" usage enhances communication though arousing connotative affiliations of "localness," and should not be discouraged, the child equipped only with "pidgin" will continually stand outside the educational and economic mainstream of his society. In the Global Village, communicating and economic survival demands an ability to speak and write competently in Standard English. Competent multi-lingualism, not a careless reinforcement of language enclaves, is necessary if a group is to exercise skills of self-autonomy in a Hawaii moving even closer to the world-wide influences of media, economy and power structures.

And as the "outsider" chooses to temper his ethnic uniqueness to become more communicative within a common social framework, institutions must also bend to accommodate a plurality of cultural inputs. The institutionalized cultural imperative must be relaxed to allow for greater participation of the "outsider."

Recognition in the Islands, for example, that the system of ukupau is efficient as well as compatible with a diverse Hawaiian lifestyle is a significant reappraisal of our traditional institutions in accordance with cultural diversity. Ukupau is a system whereby workers are paid on a piece-work basis rather than on a time basis. Instead of working on an 8 to 5 daily time schedule, this system allows Island sanitation workers to complete their daily assigned tasks at their own speed. So if in six hours the sanitation workers can do the same amount of work that otherwise would take a ten-hour work day, they would nonetheless be paid for the ten hour day, allowing for a free afternoon. The Hawaiian lifestyle, insensitive to the need to work according to an imposed notion of time, is, in this case, made an integral and workable alternative in traditional institutions.

This incorporation of cultural diversity in our social systems can possibly be extended in a like manner to other environments and situations. In the island classroom perhaps the best communicative environment is not always the traditional teacher-to-student authoritarian dialogue. Perhaps some students would respond more fruitfully given newer, more creative institutional assumptions about the best type of interaction in a pluralistic setting. The College of Education, the Department of Education and individual teachers are currently struggling to facilitate learning in the pluralistic classroom with a variety of experimental tools. Ultimately their success will depend on public and parental support for their work, and the sensitivity of their new tools to the underlying cultural assumptions.

The public media, the political process, the economic system, land usage and welfare programs are but a few more institutions demanding similar reexamination. How these institutions could be altered to meet wider cultural inputs is an answer coming from greater action, dialogue and participation of all of Hawaii's citizenry. Of course the "nuts and bolts" issues are unanswered by many of these admittedly idealistic generalities. But self-criticism among those who have "made it," the "Insider" whose cultural values and communication skills are productive in traditional institutions, is a beginning step towards reappraising systems and accommodating varying cultural inputs. And as a consequence those who are "insiders" need not necessarily feel that by so diversifying institutions they must also incur a personal sacrifice. The motivation for social change need not be a paternalistic instinct for the "outsider." Nor must the "Insider" respond to the "outsider" merely out of fear of survival. To seek social progress with the attitude that "unless something is done the poor are going to take away our homes" is a form of negative reinforcement with dubious consequences. Repression of the "outsider" is the most likely result of emphasizing that poverty, frustration and overpopulation threatens the "Insider" unless social progress ensues.

In a more positive sense, those who are "insiders" can be shown that in a society of immigrants and natives, all people are interdependent with each other for social needs and rewards. To adapt to an uncertain future the island community requires the widest range of cultural resources to help shape and direct institutions. The list is nearly inexhaustible of the crisis areas daily intensified by a blindness to the possible cultural alternatives awaiting a truly pluralistic society. Respect for the natural environment, the effective use of leisure time, a reevaluation of senseless competition and the advantageous values of cooperation, obligation to community, political integrity, family coherency, spiritual harmony, the conflict of the generations and the care for the elderly,

to name but a few modern industrial crises, are frequently unresolved, even worsened, by the cultural imperatives of the "insiders." But viable social alternatives in the Asian value system, the Polynesian or Filipino family, the rich human resources in the island community are potentially useful to provide the stability and humanism for a society pragmatic in its outlook. The search for answers to American needs often begins with an examination of the valuable inputs possible by those once recognized as "outsiders," the "deprived."

In the course of recognizing the real contributions of diverse cultural imperatives to a more rewarding society, one outcome will be an unprecedented exercise in intercultural communication and the development of institutionally-based common experiences and values between people. Through need, interdependency and respect the "ability to communicate" in a pluralistic society will evolve, hopefully, into a mundane rather than impossible exercise. What will be necessary, of course, will be at several levels a commitment to responsible social reconstruction. Culture, ethnic identity and assimilation will need to lose the attached stigmas of nostalgia, racial hatred, inferiority and a fear of change and growth. Institutions will need to be continually democratized, extending "rights to communicate" and incorporating diverse cultural values. And a recognition that all parts and groups in a society are interdependent to contribute to advancing new social directions will be the creative image, the meaningful goal, of a people who hope to accurately call themselves "free," "democratic" and "progressive."

DISCUSSION

Conscience is the wellspring of our morality but education is necessary for the survival of a democracy. Reasoning together does not always meet with consensus. Oftentimes the law must step in to determine what is best for the public good.

The Policy Ethics discussion group under Dr. Lees raised questions on how to develop ground rules for community dialog and the conflict between the public's right to know and the need for secrecy in diplomatic negotiations. And, since individuals are not equal in their abilities or resources to communicate, do we need censors or spokespersons to simplify issues and to speak for those who are not well-equipped to do so.

The group arrived at this consensus: "We recognize the right of everyone in the community to hear and to be heard, the right of access to information and the right to express views and to raise issues. As a free society, we need to search for better ways to help all people to express themselves on public policies."

Dr. Miller's dialog group on Positive Law also agreed it is not enough to know how to read and to write. For citizens to communicate effectively with decision-makers, they must have a fundamental understanding of how the government operates--its processes, principles, rules and policies.

Its discussion sought to define positive law and to examine both the need for access to information and the need for privacy in some areas. It was noted

that special interest groups tend to dominate government decision-making, with the public often not represented. So, the discussion went on, even with a "sunshine law," there is still a need for a public representative to have any effect on the decision-making outcomes.

Hawaii owes its rich cultural heritage to the multi-ethnic groups that call these islands their home. The recent influx of immigrants is finding it increasingly difficult to surmount language barriers. This has given rise to deep fears and hatreds between "locals" and newcomers.

Participants in the discussion on Cultural Values led by Dr. Ogawa agreed the bilingual-bicultural experimental tools of the Department of Education, the University of Hawaii and other community organizations are helpful in bridging the gap for better understanding. Involved was not the question on the right to communicate but the ability to communicate.

They recognized the need to instill in all that people are interdependent. Each can learn and profit from the other.

MAUI DIALOG

KEY PERSONS, ORGANIZATIONS AND POLICY ISSUES

Island Sponsor: Communications Workshop

Date and Place: Thursday, March 25, 1:30 - 4:00 p.m. and 6:30 - 9:30 p.m. at
CAMERON CENTER, WAILUKU, MAUI

Island Coordinator: Mr. Glenn Reyes (Maui Jaycees)

Participating Organizations: Aloha United Way
Maui Jaycees
Maui Community College

Academic Humanists: Mr. Clyde Sakamoto, Cross-Cultural Communication, MCC
Professor David Lees, Philosophy, MCC
Professor Will Griffiths, Philosophy, MCC

Resource Persons and
Rapporteurs: Ms. Alice Hanen
Mr. Ben Ikemori
Ms. Lori Lai
Mr. Dan Ordonez
Mr. Roy Pacubez

Policy Issues: How can people be motivated to provide more citizen input at state and local government hearings? What communication techniques and policies should be developed?

Should low-income persons be significantly involved in cable television development on Maui? What should be done with Maui's public access cable channels?

Is there a need for a "Media Council" to monitor newspapers, radio and television reporting on Maui?

How can community groups and public agencies (such as the United Fund Agencies, etc.) more effectively communicate their role and activities to the public at large?

Is communication between different cultural and ethnic groups a problem on Maui?

INTRODUCTION

The Dialog on Maui was held on Thursday, March 25 in two parts, an afternoon session and an evening session. Both sessions were held at the Cameron Center, a new multi-purpose facility in Wailuku (very near the Maui Community College), which houses all the United Way agencies and provides a meeting place for community groups on Maui.

Maui's "communities" are spread out in several far-flung population centers on a relatively large island (i.e., Kaanapali, Wailuku, Kahului, Hana, etc.) so a wide variety of community groups were contacted in pre-planning meetings, and newspaper articles were combined with radio spots produced by island coordinator, Glenn Reyes, to publicize the meetings. The issues set out included citizen input in government processes, public access to cable channels, need for media councils, community groups and agencies' use of publicity methods and cross-cultural communication issues.

Most of these issues were discussed at least once in the two sessions: several were discussed in great detail.

The humanities scholars led group discussions in the evening session, and provided essays for inclusion in the project. Professor Will Griffiths and Professor David Lees led group discussions on technology, impact of media and the future of cable television on Maui, and Griffiths' paper follows up in elaboration of his thoughts on humans and their interaction with technology. They also discussed the idea of University and community groups and their problems competing with Madison Avenue--produced advertisements for the public attention. Clyde Sakamoto's group began with several group activities to highlight and draw out self-image of different occupational, age and ethnic groups, followed by discussions of how cross-cultural communication could be improved on Maui.

The focuses and immediate benefits of the Maui dialog were several: 1) The first "seeds" for broad-based community groups concerned with communication rights and lifestyle issues were planted; 2) The business/young family people element of the community (Jaycees) were for the first time involved in planning and executing a new type of community service and concept; 3) For the first time on Maui representatives of the cable industry met with people from the University and business community to discuss how public access cable television channels could or should work; 4) The concept of a media council was presented and reactions were given to the idea by the out-of-school adults present.

Ms. Nelson, in her paper, reports that three needs emerged from the Maui Dialog: community-developed programming, increased public access, and better information about alternatives open to the community.

The Sakamoto, Barnes and Kie paper ties together an earlier "Ethnopluralism Project" on Maui, and some thoughts on communication lifestyles and relates these to the issues discussed in the Right to Communicate Dialog. The authors conclude that a number of specific communication rights are needed.

Professor Griffiths discusses, in a wide-ranging fashion, the source of modern technology and the impact it has on the lives of all of us. He says, "It would seem that technological practice aims to produce instant and universal availability of everything." The instant world of transportation and communication technology changes "things" in interesting ways.

THE MAUI WORKSHOP ON THE RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE

by Marjorie Nelson

The Right to Communicate, a conceptual extension beyond existing communication rights, is a not yet fully defined topic of International dialogue. Efforts are presently underway to determine the parameters of this concept through research, reflection, and scholarly, as well as grass-roots, discussion. The Maui workshop, one such "grass-roots" dialogue, provided this writer with increased insight regarding the practical concerns surrounding this concept, particularly those concerns and needs of a small and somewhat isolated community.

As I cannot claim Maui as my place of residence, I will not presume to describe the communication situation on that island in anything but the most tentative of terms. I can only relate my personal responses to points which were raised in the Right to Communicate discussion group I attended. As a "Honoluluian" I was struck by many of the concerns raised by the Maui residents; concerns which I had not fully appreciated prior to participating in the workshop.

Three primary needs or concerns seemed to emerge from the discussion: 1) the need for community-developed programming; 2) the need for increased public access to communication channels; and 3) the need for information in general and, more specifically, the need for information regarding the communication alternatives available to a community. These were all concerns which I had previously encountered and discussed in abstract terms, but the Maui workshop provided me with a "direct" confrontation with these issues. As all three points are closely linked, it might be helpful to differentiate what is meant by each.

The need for community-developed programming refers to a "community" need rather than a need of the individual. As a community, Maui has a need to create its own programs (TV, radio) as well as printed matter. At present, much, if not most, of its "media" appears to be imported from Honolulu and the mainland. This imported material does not and perhaps cannot reflect the community-bound needs, values, and concerns of Maui residents. While some importation may be necessary and desirable to provide a measure of contact with other communities, Maui residents have a need to develop their own unique media for themselves and for peoples beyond the boundaries of the Maui community. In other words, the message flow to date has been in a one-way direction from the outside into Maui. Maui may have a need, however, for an increased flow of messages within the boundaries of its own community and an increased flow of messages from its community to other communities. Recognition of this need may, and indeed should, lead to the proposition that Maui residents, as a whole, not only have the right to receive messages generated from outside their community but also have the right to create and transmit messages within their community for their community and other communities.

The need for increased public access to communication channels refers to a need of the individual or groups rather than a whole community. Communication channels are primarily, if not wholly, controlled by businesses and public agencies. Individuals and small groups have had limited opportunity to present their messages through the media. The wealthier few may buy time, but that remains an alternative for a limited number of persons. Cable television provides a technical medium which can function to increase public access. Because of the large number of channels provided by this medium, it becomes possible to conceive of and even provide public access channels.

The cable television situation on Maui was discussed by the group I was in and various problems were raised regarding the practicality and even desirability of public access. Legislative complications were noted due to the variation between FCC and state requirements. The FCC requires a minimum amount of public access to a cable system based on community size. The state, however, requires that one channel be made available for public access, regardless of the community size. The problem of equipment characteristics was mentioned as equipment used by community members may not meet the technical requirements of the system. Competitive programming was also perceived to be a problem due to the lack of consistency in public access productions. (It should be noted that all of these problems were cited by a cable system owner.) There seemed to be a general lack of information regarding the inherent versus created problems and limitations of cable and the potential services which this medium could provide. (Which relates to the third need cited above.)

Despite the noted problems, however, the group did seem to think that a real need existed in Maui for increased individual and group access to communication channels. Such access was seen as a means for better meeting the needs of particular groups as well as the community as a whole. It might be stated then, that individuals and groups on Maui have the right of access to communication channels.

The need for information is basic to any social organization. Obviously Maui has a need for information which is not available within its own boundaries. This information may be for business, political, educational, social, medical, or any number of other purposes. No community can maintain a complete and independent store of information, but Maui's somewhat isolated situation makes it even more vital that it exchange information with outside sources. As noted above, there seemed to be a particular lack of information, at least in that discussion group, regarding the communication alternatives available to Maui. I perceived, perhaps incorrectly, that there was a need for more information in this area. To again assume the liberty of transferring this need into a right, Maui's residents, as individuals and as a community, have the right to the information necessary to fulfill personal and social needs.

Three need areas have been discussed and developed into rights. These rights may be viewed as essential components of the Right to Communicate. The Right to Communicate, then, appears to be particularly relevant to Maui residents in terms of their right to community-developed programming, their right to public access, and their right to information. There may be, and undoubtedly are, other communication rights which are also of concern to the peoples of Maui. These three emerge from a very preliminary, brief and tentative look at the needs of that particular community.

THE RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE IN ISLAND COMMUNITIES:
FROM ETHNOPLURALISM TO COMMUNICATION LIFESTYLES

by Clyde Sakamoto, Bruce Barnes, and Kathleen A. Kie

This essay combines the experiences of its authors--particularly Sakamoto in Malaysia and Paris; Barnes in Nigeria, and Kie in Japan and Burma, and uses that experience to provide a perspective on communication in Maui. The Ethnopluralism Project and the Right to Communicate Dialog are reported and discussed.

Ethnopluralism

Ethnic diversity is a fact of life in Hawaii. No ethnic group has a numerical majority. On the other hand, people in many groups consider themselves and are considered by others as a minority of one sort or another. The ethnopluralism activities attempted to enhance communication between different cultural and ethnic groups on Maui. A video feedback procedure was used.

The Ethnopluralism Project began with the idea that a lack of shared information leads to stereotypes and misunderstandings. This works in two ways. The less the members of one group knows about the members of another group, the more likely are communication difficulties. The more members of one group knows about several other groups, the more likely they are to appreciate themselves.

Participants in the projects were high school students from five ethnic groups: Hawaiian, Portugese, Japanese, "Haole," and Filipino. Video technology was used to "store and transfer" information. In this way, members of one ethnic group could meet and discuss their own ethnicity and these discussions were recorded, and viewed later by members of other groups.

There were three steps in the process. One group, say the Hawaiians, made a videotape of one of their discussions. Later, another group, say the Japanese, watched the video tape, and discussed it--their "watching" and their discussion were also videotaped. Then, the Hawaiian group watched the Japanese tape.

Selected student comments made during this experience follow:

You have to at least know your own culture. I mean just because you're in Hawaii, you're going to forget your own culture?

. . .

The culture affects me right there. My own culture affects me because I don't get around, you know. I don't have the like, you know, the rights. I mean, you know, I kind of feel left out Look, what's more important, being shamed or, you know, your culture? I mean it's okay . . . If other people can understand us It's okay, you know, if you're living . . . someplace where they accept you as a _____, if they don't put you down.

. . .

I agree with them, religion does keep the your family together alot. But so does tradition. I don't know why everybody says that tradition isn't--there isn't any. I still feel there is or else there wouldn't be Hawallan people doing Hawallan things or Japanese people doing things they used to do. That's all a part of tradition. . . . I don't see why everybody says tradition is dying, because just knowing about what used to happen makes a difference.

. . . .

I think that this tape of the guys was a really good tape. I really enjoyed it.

Yeah, Like they really didn't boast on anything and they really didn't put themselves down. They just told--what is. The way they put it is we have a place in society and we just blend in with everybody else.

That's true. I really liked the tape. The things they said and the way they said it. That bunch . . . seemed to have a good humor. I mean, they could care less what anybody tells about them. They're individuals, they're _____, they consider themselves Hawallan. That's the way to think, I guess. I had a different impresslon of what I had expected from other things that I've heard, hearsay and stuff. I didn't expect them to be that open and objective.

Detailed reports on this project are available through the first author.

Each of the ethnic groups described itself as "low" or "down" in comparison with other groups. All groups felt "pidgin" was the common and most important bridge between groups. Most groups felt better about themselves and about the others after the exchange of videotapes.

The video technology offers one way to create common experiences. The challenge on Maui is, of course, to create common experiences that both appeal to and transcend the various ethnic groups. Some areas for that common experience range from social, political, sociological and economic issues to parent-teacher-student, neighborhood-community issues and on to person concerns for self-development. While world communication scenarios need to be invented, equally, local community discovery through imaginative use of new communication technology deserves attention.

"Cable" is coming to Maui. Cable plus low-cost video production makes public access to new ways of communication possible for all citizens of Maui. The tapes used in the ethnopluralism project could, for example, have been received on regular TV sets in Maui homes over cable.

On Maui, new communication technology can be used by us for discussion of questions of importance to us.

Communication Lifestyles

The way people communicate with each other determines who they are and influences what they become. In Hawaii, ethnic pluralism and cultural diversity are other names for communication lifestyles. Only some of the communication patterns found within a group grow from within that group itself. Outside influences--schools, churches, mass media, etc.--increasingly affect how people communicate with each other. Video technology, for example, may affect in far-reaching ways communication styles in Hawaii.

The people of Hawaii range in communication lifestyles from rural Kauai, for example, to busy downtown Honolulu and its media-intensive environment. On Kauai, comments by several people indicated a very strong dependence on interpersonal communication. The need to see the person while talking, to "see" the reactions to the messages was very important. The people there described telephones as useful to contact relatives on the further distant parts of the island and to find out when stores closed, for example, but the telephone was rarely thought of as a means to discuss a problem with an official in a government agency. In the rural environment, mass media such as television are frequently relegated to a minor role, often serving more as background "noise," while conversation and interactions appear more central than in the urban environment. The lack of locally relevant programming may contribute to this use pattern.

Urban Honolulu, on the other hand shares many of the common communication characteristics of mainland U.S. cities, with advertising agencies, computers, television stations and CB (citizens band) adding to the din. The island of Oahu, however, still encompasses varied communications lifestyles including the range from predominantly agricultural Waialae-Waiakane valley and other rural "outposts" on the windward side, as well as bustling Waikiki.

Ethnic diversity of Hawaii reflects itself in the communications channels utilized or preferred by different cultural and age groups. The television channels until very recently projected almost totally mainland "haole" program content, newscasters and commercials produced for large mainland companies and products. Hawaii 5-0 is perhaps the world's single largest "message" originating in Hawaii and yet in content and format is almost identical to many other crime/police shows originating in mainland U.S. cities.

Japanese culture finds an outlet in channel 9, where samurai movies appeal to the first and second generations (Issei and Nissei) and various Japanese science fiction characters (Kikkaido, Kamen Rider, etc.) have captured the attention of the young children. Kung-fu and karate films find large audiences among martial arts fans, cutting across many of the ethnic groups in Hawaii. Radio stations include Filipino stations, Japanese stations, Hawaiian music stations, and the usual other AM and FM stations.

One attribute of mass media in Hawaii which may be cause for concern is the predominance of mainland ownership in newspapers and radio/television stations in Hawaii. It appears difficult to see how a "local" Hawaii communication lifestyle can project from an institution where most management and programming decisions are made in a different cultural environment.

Cable television appears very promising in that small groups could potentially have access to this new medium and reflect better the diversity and more local issues on the various islands. Unfortunately again, cable operators seem predominantly to come from the mainland corporation-profit oriented background, so that to date cable's potential remains largely untapped.

Current Hawaii Communication Problems

1) Many observers in Hawaii comment on certain feelings of inferiority or low self-esteem among various ethnic groups in Hawaii. Self-image and stereotypes are a part of the inter-group problems, and need to be dealt with directly, using any communications methods which are suitably personal such as the techniques used by the Maui ethnopluralism project. Although manifested in inter-personal communication, these problems are easily worsened by the mass media if certain harmful stereotypes are reinforced. Thus, there is a need for more research and analysis in this area in Hawaii.

2) Violence in the schools and outside the schools between differing ethnic groups is closely related to the problem described above. Problems between immigrants and "locals" certainly are related to stereotyping and to the self-image of both groups. Again, mass media such as television emphasize violence predominantly. The most powerful "message" emanating from Hawaii on the mass media is Hawaii 5-0, which seems to convey several subtle messages about Hawaii and its people which are not a true mirror of Hawaii: first, that Hawaii is a criminal/syndicate infested place with so much violence that a super-police agency is needed to constantly combat it. Second, the idea that only a Caucasian "super-cop" is capable of heading such a super-unit police agency, and the local non-Caucasians are only capable of leg-work type jobs in that unit. Both of these ideas badly distort reality in Hawaii, as any resident for even a short time can readily observe. Hawaii's police and detective squads are predominantly non-Caucasian, working in a culture that at one time was non-violent, tolerant and not at all like the human interaction patterns portrayed in Hawaii 5-0 (essentially a Los Angeles urban cultural setting with Hawaii scenery grafted on the back).

3) Language itself--what is the proper role of pidgin English in the Hawaii of today? Should Ilocano, Japanese, Samoan and Vietnamese replace Spanish and German in our curriculums? These are communication problems also, and related to the above problems.

Right to Communicate

Our future ideal Hawaii might then encompass many specific communication "rights" for its citizens: the "right" to know ethnic stereotypes and understand other cultures to the point that stereotype, become irrelevant (through education), the "right" to have equal access to all the video, news, weather and educational benefits that cable television could provide in the future no matter what ethnic or economic background, the "right" to mass media that are owned by a cross-section of Hawaii's population, the "right" to television programming that accurately projects realistic images of Hawaii's people, the "right" to mass media messages

that do not promote violence but rather emphasize the tolerance and sharing which is a part of life in Hawaii, the "right to multiple fluency and equality of Hawaii's citizens in the many languages and dialects in Hawaii, including pidgin and, finally, the "right" to communication and media "heroes" that are truly "of HAWAII." Perhaps both Hawaii residents and new immigrants should have a "right" to education in a choice of two or three Asian/Pacific languages, as well as English.

THINKING ABOUT THINKING ABOUT TECHNOLOGY

by Will Griffis

One of the difficulties in writing these days is that the nature of life is such that it seems increasingly impossible to address human problems within the framework and idiom of any single discipline. I find myself bouncing from one vantage to another, sometimes speaking as a philosopher, sometimes as a social scientist, sometimes as a teacher, sometimes as an ecologist, sometimes as a father and husband concerned with the welfare of his family, sometimes as a man concerned simultaneously about himself and other human beings.

From some of these vantage points I am less than erudite. And it is often difficult to find language since I cannot stick to the idiom of a single discipline. We live in an age of rapid and accelerating technological change, so rapid that there seems no other way to capture what is happening at a point than to pounce on it from many different directions and to hope in this fashion to understand a little for a moment of where we are. In the end, of course, what one person captures in this way may have more to do with where he is at than where we are at. But in today's world this is the best that one man can do.

So, much of what follows is not really a philosophical essay written by a philosopher. It is rather one person circling some issues that seem important to him. Undoubtedly, my ruminations will raise more questions than answers, but perhaps the questions themselves can lend a clarifying force to the matter. So be it.

We live in a technological age. This means at least that we live in a radically novel world. What is the nature of this new world? How are we to understand it? How are we to orient ourselves viably, humanly, within the environs of our modern technological milieu? Indeed, is it possible or even desirable to elucidate essential characteristics of technology?

I think that we can and that we must. For example, it is a discernable and pervasive tendency of modern transportation and communications technology to render the world's commodities and appurtenances ubiquitous and instantaneous. It would seem that technological practice aims to produce instant and universal availability of everything. Too, we might note a quality of "inconspicuous immediacy," perhaps even a positive "thing-character" regression, attending the devices and functions which populate our technological milieu. More on this shortly.

We think in too limited a fashion about technology. This, basically, is what I want to argue in this brief essay. And I agree with Martin Heidegger that the need to ask about technology seems to be dying out to the same extent that

technology more definitely characterizes and regulates the appearance of the totality of the world and man's place in it. I agree with him, too, that technology is coming to determine the relation of man to the world as such. There is a meaning in technology which hides itself. We need to respond to this mystery with at least some minimal preparatory thinking, with a thinking which will awaken within us a readiness for a possibility whose contour remains obscure.

This is not to say that we are unaware of problems associated with technology. We sense, though perhaps only dimly, the ubiquitous transformative power of technology. Still, this sense is rare and at best inarticulate. Of course, there is today a widespread and vocal recognition of certain "problems" of technology, many of the so-called ecological threats are linked to technology. There is talk of pollution, overpopulation, social inequities, and for some, notably among the young, a growing disdain for the "materialistic" lifestyle of the culture. Surely technology is bound up in all this, and there is awareness to that affect. But most critics today take the phenomenon of technology to be straightforward and simple, e.g., violence on television breeds violent attitudes in children who view it. Or, how are the fruits of advanced technology to be distributed to persons or cultures which do not now enjoy them? In fact the most notable and visible responses to so-called technological problems are themselves technological in nature. Since technology pollutes our lakes and streams we must devise purification technologies to meet the threat. And so on, ad infinitum. Some persons want to slow down technological development, but this does not seem feasible. Technological advance will continue and will likely move faster and faster. Even now further technological development is urgently needed just in order to deal with the undesirable, even dangerous, spinoff of current technologies.

Of course, we cannot, and necessarily cannot, devise a technique for technological invention. There can be no technology of technology. So the question remains how we are to get hold of technology. I am suggesting that some sort of more principled and rigorous examination of the phenomenon of technology is both possible and desirable. I now want to indicate in a cursory way how this might be done. I will demonstrate what direction such an examination or analysis of technology might take in a minimal and disparate way. But it is not my aim to frame here a thorough philosophical analysis of technology or even of some delimited aspect of it. Rather I want to offer a couple of brief suggestive sketches which may serve to exemplify what I mean by a fundamental examination of technology.

I mentioned above a "thing-character regression" associated with technological practice. This notion can be elaborated by focusing on the phenomenon of a technological device, keeping in mind that technology is more than a matter of machines. First, what is a technological device? What distinguishes, if anything does, a technological device from, say, a work of art or a work of nature or a simple hand tool? Hand tools are often taken to be paradigmatic technological devices. But if we look closely we note certain fundamental ontological differences between, for example, a pocket knife and a light switch. (Switches are ubiquitous and mostly innocuous technological items, everyone is familiar with them and uses them. For this reason they serve well for purposes of this discussion.)

I want to point out what I consider to be a significant lack of thing-character in the switch. (Heidegger coined the intransitive verb "thinging" to

thing, objects are things by virtue of their capacity and activity of thinging. He was criticized in the German press for this, laughed at for his funny manner of speech. But Heidegger's verb approaches what I have in mind by thing-character.) First, any object can be a switch. A switch may be ornate, a minimal work of art. Let us take a glowing red plastic triangle recessed into a black wall. (We could suppose further that the switch could be triggered without being touched as in the case of heat, light, or sound sensitive switches. A device which was designed for my telephone allows me to halt its ringing with a loud clap of my hands. But to add this dimension to the discussion widens the issue beyond the modest scope of this essay. Even with switches which have to be pressed or "flicked" there is significant lack of kinesthetic demand or involvement. When I can fill my home with stereophonic music with a clap of my hands I have accomplished something akin to magic!)

I observe the triangle, perhaps I admire its soft glow and a subtle pleasing balance in its contrast against the expanse of black wall. Perhaps I observe that wall plus triangle together advantageously contrast and highlight features of the room as a whole. I am admiring a minimal work of art or an aesthetically pleasing decor.

What I am doing in this room with a black wall and glowing triangle is seeking to relieve myself, to urinate. I am in the bathroom at a friend's home. After admiring the decor as best I can in the semi-dark I am searching for the light switch. Design custom and my own experience with switches guide my search. (It happens that light switches are fairly similar in design and placement, but there is no necessary reason for this, it is little more than habit, inertia. But if this were not the case than I would not have the vaguest notion where to begin looking for the light switch in my friend's bathroom.) I feel about almost randomly. I chance to press the triangle, perhaps because its location reminds me of where I've seen other switches. The light pops on, the room is instantly illuminated.

As we observe basic aspects of thing-character recession. For the moment I learn that the triangle is a switch I cease to regard it as a minimal work of art. In an important sense the switch is not a thing at all for me any longer. It is a common experience to remember where a switch is located but not to remember what it looks like. This is not an instance of forgetting in general but a forgetting specific to switches. Nor are the features I describe "quirks" of switches. A switch is paradigmatic of devices in general and what is true of a switch is true in degrees of difference of all technological devices and of technological practice in general. Or so I would argue.

Once a thing is identified as a switch its thing-qualities recede, a switch is transparent as a thing. If we hunt for the thingness of the switch in the device for which it is a switch we will not find it, for the device itself disappears into the function which it was designed to perform. The function in turn collapses in a "punctual conflation" into the satisfaction of an anticipation.

Technological evolution is characterized by increasing recession of means in favor of ends. Quoting Borgmann: In the progress of technology, the function

Increases in prominence and purity whereas the machinery shrinks and recedes. Borgmann goes on the point out, rightly, I think, that this tendency can easily be seen in designs of the modern home environment. The advances in recording and sound reproduction equipment of the past couple of decades are good examples.

Now, the more pure a function becomes the more isolated from context the need which it satisfies becomes. Let us take warmth for example. In a relatively pre-technological period heat came to be present through the fire in the hearth. The fire bespoke selection of wood, splitting and proper drying, the experience, skill, and attention required for building and maintaining a good fire. Soot on the wall told of the time of year and the season. In this case the satisfaction of need for warmth is deeply woven into the context of the world. In a more technological world the heating plant produces heat and nothing else besides. Warmth becomes liberated from any context whatsoever, and so our need for warmth is similarly purified, radically isolated from context, and we come to need warmth and nothing else besides.

What are the consequences of this? At least, in Borgmann's words, we may say, that the world of present things is shrinking. A dire consequence of the technological isolation of needs is that with isolation and instant satisfaction of needs there need be no check on the proliferation of needs and their satisfactions, nor any way of discriminating among them. Needs can be multiplied wantonly, capriciously. In fact it is the rule of technology that they must be. Or so it would seem. (It occurs to me that the doom scenarios of the future may not see the worst. Possibly man will become a thriving silly, shallow beast, mindlessly caught up in his own technology, totally lost in an obsessive organizing of meaningless activity.)

So, technological practice progressively suppresses means in favor of functions, a tendency exemplified in the evolution of modern technological devices. This involves a recession of things in general and is evident specifically in devices, of which the switch has been our example.

There are bound to be problems of orientation in such a world, i.e., a highly technological world. For one thing, if everything is instantly and equally available then no thing is more valuable than another, the world is potentially swept clear of values. This describes nihilism. One the eve of this century Nietzsche said that nihilism was knocking on the door. More recently Martin Heidegger wrote that it was foolish to bar the door any longer since the guest was already moving about in the house. We are in the midst of a vast cultural nihilism. To document this requires another essay. It is my hunch that the modern nihilism and technology are intimately linked.

I want to offer a few disparate concluding remarks on technology. Technology comes from somewhere, basically its transformative power derives out of the scientific way of explaining the world. The frame of reference of natural science is only one of a number of possible approaches to the world, in fact it is quite a specialized and esoteric frame. But it is widely believed and argued that natural science constitutes the only view, or at least the most basic, true, view of reality.

The transformative power of empirical science renders it of tremendous importance, certainly. But science and technology cannot, in principle, provide the only or even the most fundamental perspective on man and world. Science and technology necessarily, though mostly implicitly, rely upon a more fundamental pre-scientific ontology. (Borgmann speaks of a "guiding ontology.") Roughly, an ontology tells us what there is while scientific explanation tells us how it works. Science as science has no resource for deciding what is to be explained, technology has no mechanism for deciding what function will be made available, a technique of technological invention is not just impossible, it is meaningless.

When I search about in the woods for a stick with which to probe the streambed in order to discover its hidden contour, I am oriented to the world in a technological stance. (Interestingly, as I grasp the stick and begin to probe the stick recedes as a thing into the topology of the streambed. Too, my experience of the world is here mediated in a way which is characteristic of technological practice. This aspect of the mediating influences of technology deserves fuller discussion. But not here.)

When I pause on my journey through the forest to admire the beauty of the sun's last rays streaming through branches and tree trunks, when I quietly observe the intricate pattern of light and shade traced across the forest floor, when I simply enjoy the peace and quiet of nature, reflecting, perhaps, pondering the meaning of my life, in moments such as these I am no longer engaged in the world technologically. But today the technological frame becomes more pervasive, more dominant, so that such moments as those of contemplation or aesthetic quietude are quite rare for most people. Technology and science come more and more to determine our relation to reality as such.

In conclusion. These remarks hardly constitute a coherent statement about technology. Instead I have wanted to sketch out a few interrelated sorties and fragments on technology. My aim has been to stimulate a widening of considerations as regards the question of technology.

I close with some remarks of Norman Mailer to be found in his "Rolling Stone" interview of 1/16/76 (p.46)

We have to contemplate the notion that God and the Devil were in one game and got farted out by a bigger game. Technology comes out of impulses that may have very little to do with God and the Devil. Technology's almost a visitor from afar. Technology may come out of another impulse altogether Now our heads are beginning to spin before the complexities of this . . . and [I] argue . . . that housecleaning may have to begin in the highest temple of them all.

I write these follow-up comments after the Communication Workshop on Maui. Nowhere in the remarks is there mention of communication. But considerations which I raise bear on communication and communications technology. In effect, implicitly if not explicitly, I am suggesting that questions of communication are at least partially but importantly bound up with wider questions of technology and technological practice.

Credit for ideas and perspectives expressed in the essay goes to several persons, though they cannot be held responsible for overall or particular points of view. Thanks to Dick Auerswald for inspiring the title and for language in introductory remarks. Both his writings and our conversations have benefited me.

Albert Borgmann is responsible for important ideas expressed herein. Borgmann, of the University of Montana, has done several pioneering papers on philosophy of technology. There is hardly an idea expressed in the essay which he has not already raised in one or another of his papers, some of which are as yet unpublished.

Finally, I owe thanks to Martin Heidegger; some of his later writings, especially, have influenced my thinking.

I could go on, it is difficult for a person to say where he gets his ideas. In the end what is said must stand on its own, wherever it comes from.

HAWAII DIALOG

KEY PERSONS, ORGANIZATIONS AND POLICY ISSUES

Island Sponsor: Big Island Press Club

Date and Place: Saturday, April 25, 9-1 p.m., Hilo Melshion Center

Island Coordinator: Mr. Fred Reedy

Participating Organizations: Hawaii County Office of Aging
Hawaii Island Chamber of Commerce
Big Island Video
Hawaii County Bar Association
Big Island Press Club

Academic Humanists: Dr. Edward Fujimoto, Communication
Dr. Leila Kanno, Language Arts

Resource Persons and
Rapporteurs: Ms. Gladys Howell
Mr. John Burgess
Mr. Hugh Clark
Mr. John Dobovan
Ms. Shella Dobovan
Mr. Alan Parker
Mr. Dave Shapiro
Mr. Robert Youngman

Policy Issues: What do Big Island people feel they need that they don't now have to participate effectively in the activities of the community? What changes in policy are required? What legal guarantees--such as the sunshine law--to a Right to Communicate do Big Island citizens have? And what guarantees when he/she does not want to be communicated with? Are Big Islanders prepared--by culture and training--to use communication opportunities that now exist?

INTRODUCTION

A public Big Island workshop on the Right of Everyone in Hawaii to Communicate was held on Saturday, April 24, from 8:45 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. at Hilo Melshion Mission, 97 Olana Street, Hilo. More than fifty persons gathered to participate in the workshop.

Its purpose was to encourage concerned Big Islanders to evaluate their communication needs and the institutions presently working to serve them. Those attending represented the views of organizations or groups they belonged to or as individuals. Our purpose was to focus attention on specific issues relating to the Big Island, and to consider appropriate communication policy.

The right to communicate is as yet undefined. But if it is a right we have, and if it is to be guaranteed that we never lose our right to communicate, the concept must be understood and defined.

Our purpose was to examine ourselves and our community through as wide public participation as possible in order to determine what communication rights we have and want. The scope of the discussion was broad and open to any issue relating to communication. Among topics suggested by interested people were:

- 1) How well do the media on the Big Island do their jobs? Are all opinions given equal or proportionate coverage in newspaper columns and broadcast news programs? Should they be? Is there enough investigative reporting being done?
- 2) What groups of Big Island residents--senior citizens for instance--have special needs for information? Who attempts to determine and deal with these needs? To whom should this responsibility fall?
- 3) What groups of Big Island residents--elderly, ethnic, women's, community association, for instance--have special needs to disseminate information or points of view? What media access do they or should they have?
- 4) What communication problems are unique to a multi-cultural, multi-lingual society? A common assumption is that mass media homogenize society, but can it be turned around so that the media can be used to preserve and protect cultural identities?
- 5) Do the Big Island's three cable television franchises have a moral obligation to initiate programming of local concern? To promote use of video equipment and public access channels? By what priorities should they operate? What limits--censorship of pornography, for instance--should be placed on the use of public communication channels and who should decide this?

These questions, and many more like them, are of concern to all of us and our ideas and opinions will help to stimulate further thought and discussion, and the development of communication policy.

This Big Island workshop was intended to build understanding through community dialog of the emerging concept of the Right to Communicate, and to relate such understanding to communication policy implications for Hawaii. The Right to Communicate embraces traditional concepts such as free expression and free press, but also is an attempt to accommodate the new technological capabilities with the felt need for two-way communication, rather than the one-way mass media model Hawaii is a particular place with its own values and context, and this dialog was an attempt to discover what they are in relation to communication rights.

Specific issues varied depending on the particular concerns of the various groups involved. One common issue, however, was openness in government, or the "sunshine" bill and its policy implications for communication rights. Others included community concern over media coverage of social welfare or youth. Access by citizens to the mass media was another possible concern.

The expectations or goals of the dialog sessions were to, primarily, build better understanding policy implications for Hawaii of the emerging Right to Communicate, and then as related goal to bring together persons with interests in this subject with the hope that the dialogue and other activity will continue on the Big Island.

The emerging Right to Communicate is capable of changing human communication in far-reaching ways, and various groups are being asked to help initiate community-level dialog in Hawaii. The Right to Communicate is now on the global agenda in such groups as Unesco and the International Broadcast Institute, but local community input is vital if the Right to Communicate is to be adequately defined and effective.

For the other islands, all the papers were written by the academic humanists. In the Big Island case, the first paper is co-authored by the two humanists and has much of the flavor of a news report. The second paper was requested because the "access to technology" is such an important part of the Right to Communicate. The third paper was written by the coordinator who happens also to be a journalist. All three papers reflect the dialog among the several authors.

In their paper, Fujimoto and Kanno list 27 issues that were generated out of the dialog between the coordinator, the humanists, and other members of the workshop planning team. Three issues are most important and are suitable for detailed discussion. As is so often the case, the intensive planning dialog led to some important new understandings that were reflected in the conduct of the Big Island public dialog session. Fujimoto and Kanno discuss these new understandings in their paper.

The second paper by the Dobovans reviews the role of communications technology in the day-to-day activities of Big Island residents. They are concerned with citizen access to the ways and means of communication, and use "cable" as an example to develop their concerns. They point out that public access cable programs do "offer small groups a chance to air materials which have no other outlet." They conclude that new communications technologies can be used in many ways by the general public.

The final paper grew out of an interview with Fred Reedy, first published in the Hawaii Tribune Herald, and it reflects the deep concerns of a thoughtful journalist as he goes about his day to day reporting activities. He is especially concerned with a Right to Communicate in a multi-cultural and multi-lingual community, and the practice of that right in ways that do not infringe on the rights of others.

RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE: BIG ISLAND ISSUES AND POSSIBILITIES

by Edward Fujimoto and Leila Kanno

I. Planning Sessions/Issues/Dialog Format:

The Big Island Right to Communicate Dialog Session was developed through a series of planning session in which the Island Dialog Coordinator and the academic humanists met to define the "human right to communicate" concept, and to design the parameters of this concept in terms of the grant proposal. Although we were supplied with much information about the "human right to communicate" dimensions that were being explored on the national and international levels, we needed to come to grips with the meaning of this concept on the local level. More specifically, this concept had to be meaningful to the people of the Big Island. Therefore, the first planning group (comprised of the Coordinator and the academic humanists) decided to explore the "human right to communicate" concept on the following issues:

1. The Right to Communicate: What is it? What guarantees it? What guarantees a person's right not to be communicated with?
2. Use of Communication Media: Will people take advantage of available channels to send and receive information? How do we get people to use the media in sending and receiving information?
3. Big Island Media Situation: Are there sufficient channels of communication presently available on the Big Island? Are these channels equally open to all individuals on the Big Island?

Preliminary discussion on these issues indicated that representative community input would be an important second step. Consequently, a number of sponsoring organizations were contacted and invited to participate in the next series of planning sessions. These organizations were: the Big Island Press Club, Hawaii County Office of Aging, Hawaii Island Chamber of Commerce, Big Island Video, Media Advisory Council, and the Hawaii Bar Association. There were also individuals from the County Council, representatives from KHLO, and KIPA radio stations, and a representative from the Hilo Rain (independent newspaper organization in Hilo) attending these planning sessions. From these sessions, the following issues were generated:

1. What groups of Big Island residents have special needs for information? Are those needs presently being served? How well?
2. Who should determine if/what special needs exist? By what criteria? To whom does the responsibility of serving those needs belong?

3. Does the University of Hawaii-Hilo or the State Department of Education or any other public educational institution bear some responsibility for determining and providing for special needs? Should a wider range of communication skills be taught in the public school system? What priorities should be established so that educational institutions can better serve the communication needs of the entire population?
4. What groups of Big Island residents have special needs to disseminate information or present points of view? What media access do they/should they have? Who should decide access rights and by what criteria? How should access rights be guaranteed?
5. What safeguards, if any, should there be to guard against dissemination of inaccurate, misleading, libelous or propagandistic information as technology increases a society's ability to rapidly communicate on a wide scale? How can minority rights to access be preserved in light of such safeguards?
6. What other limits--censorship of pornography, for instance--should be imposed on the use of public communication channels? Who should decide this and how?
7. Are Big Islanders taking advantage of what access they have to public communication channels? If relatively few people write letters to the editor of the Hawaii Tribune-Herald and participate in radio talk shows, can we assume there is ample access or does this mean those two modes of communication do not meet the needs of most people? For what reasons do Big Islanders fail to communicate?
8. How well do the media serving the Big Island do their jobs? Are news reports accurate and complete? Is enough investigative reporting being done or is too much time, space and energy being devoted to reacting to day-to-day events? Do daily news reports adequately present the process of social change?
9. Do Big Island news media give adequate attention to all sides of various issues? What responsibility do they have to seek out varying opinions on the issues of the day?
10. What are the problems, if any, inherent in a "one-newspaper" community such as the Big Island?
11. What social problems arise from the Big Island's lack of a rapid, island-wide communications system other than the Tribune-Herald and Hawaiian Telephone Co.? How can improved communications solve them? To whom does the responsibility of solving the problems belong--to the media, government?
12. Do Big Islanders have a right to better distribution of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and Honolulu Advertiser? To a Saturday Tribune-Herald? Should Big Islanders have the same communication services as residents of

- Oahu? Is there a good reason why they don't? What services are not provided on either island?
13. What problems arise from "outside" ownership of the Big Island's major media outlets--the Tribune-Herald, West Hawaii Today (same owner as T-H), KHLO-Radio, KPUA-Radio, for instance? If problems exist, what solutions are there?
 14. What should be the role of the Hawaii Island Media Advisory Council? What role does it play now?
 15. Cable television (CATV) offers public access, but how are people to become aware of its availability? Who should provide the necessary equipment and promote its use?
 16. What responsibility should CATV franchises have to provide programming of local concern? By what priorities should they operate?
 17. How does lack of cooperation among the Big Island's three CATV franchises affect their service to the island? Would frequent hook-ups among them solve any of the problems that may have been discussed in Question 11? In what other ways could the potentials of CATV be used to the benefit of the community?
 18. Given the principles of participatory democracy, and considering the geographical isolation of the Big Island from Honolulu and its districts from Hilo, do we need two-way CATV hook-ups among the various communities and their state and county legislative bodies, agencies, boards and commissions to enable equal access to government by all? Should governmental meetings be held at times of day that are most convenient for most people to participate?
 19. What responsibility does/should government have to provide information about itself? How should sunshine laws be enforced and made to work?
 20. What responsibility does the government have to use the CATV channel allotted to it? What should the government use it for? Given the isolation of the state from the continental U.S., does the government have a special responsibility for providing information for residents of the state?
 21. Should the government provide information centers where residents can go to receive as well as transmit information? Should it subsidize other forms of information services? If so, which ones, for whom and at what cost?
 22. Is there a general public awareness of information storage and exchange potentials provided by computers and communication satellites? Is there a responsibility to bring these types of technological advances to the general public? Who's? How quickly should it be done? How do we safeguard against invasion of privacy as we introduce these systems into society?

23. How do we organize the expanding volume of information so that it is rapidly and easily available? What responsibility do libraries have to do this for us? Are our libraries changing, or trying to change, to provide better service through technological innovations?
24. What communication problems are unique to a multi-cultural, multi-lingual society? A common assumption is that mass media homogenize society, but can it be turned around so that the media are used to preserve and protect cultural identities? What problems arise when members of one ethnic/language group dominate media jobs? Should our communication goals include universal use of Standard English or should the use of other languages, including pidgin, be encouraged?
25. Should the Big Island have its own broadcast television station? What is the value of access to a local television station either for disseminating information or influencing programming?
26. Does the need for expensive equipment and specialized technical skills to operate a CATV franchise, broadcast television station, radio station or newspaper dangerously centralize control of these resources in the hands of a few people? Would a radio station or newspaper operated specifically for public access be effective? Who should fund it?
27. Who in Hawaii should be entrusted to determine our communication needs? How should we determine what our future needs will be? Should we establish in Hawaii an independent communication council to conduct in-depth studies on basic issues of communication planning?

It soon became evident to all the members of the planning group that the originally proposed abstract dimensions of "policy ethics," "positive law," and "cultural values" had become synthesized into at least twenty-seven specific issues that seemed, in the minds of the planners, to be major problems/issues of the Big Island regarding the "human right to communicate" concept. Given these issues, the Big Island Right to Communicate Dialog Session format could not be similar to the dimensions of "policy ethics," "positive law," and "cultural values" as originally intended in the grant proposal. Instead, it was decided that the participants could be divided into at least two major groups that would have rapporteurs and local policy issue resource persons who were either media oriented or cultural values oriented. Consequently, aspects of the originally proposed dimensions of "policy ethics," "positive law," and "cultural values" were covered in each of the two discussion groups. Each group was given approximately two hours to discuss any issue that the planning session had generated, or any issue that they felt needed to be identified and discussed. The last hour would be set aside for an assembly where the rapporteurs and local policy issue resource people could report to the assembly what was covered in the different discussion groups.

II. Discussion Groups:

A. Media-Oriented Group

The media oriented group first explored the different types of information sources that were available to the people of the Big Island: there are three

major radio stations in Hilo (KHLO, KIPA, and KPUA); three major daily newspapers (Tribune-Herald, Star-Bulletin, and the Honolulu Advertiser) and one independent newspaper, the Hilo Rain; and special interest group publications such as the union publications of ILWU, Mauna Kea Hotel, and the IMUA Kohala. The group, however, quickly realized that the Tribune-Herald is the only medium on the Big Island that communicated island-wide about Big Island concerns. The group felt that this was certainly a problem that had to be resolved quickly if efficient island-wide coordination is to be realized.

The next major concern was that of the receivers of information--i.e., the Big Island public. Many of the group members felt that the local people, in general, were more "reactionary" than they were "content-oriented." They had, it seems, through the years come to look upon the media as being "benevolent overseers" of their concerns. The media seem to belong on one side, and "John Q. Public" on the other. The dynamic process of sending and receiving messages should be emphasized more to eliminate this type of media stereotyping.

Problems relating to the motivation and ability of the local residents to use the media were also discussed: the group members felt that the media should authenticate a lot more with the Big Island residents. For example, KGMB will soon have a two-way microwave system to have immediate, reciprocal coverage of the news. The newspapers should become involved in publicizing public access opportunities, and strive to develop a better "point-counter point" type format to get greater representation of views from the public rather than continue to use the traditional method of having the editor reflect his company's position and depend upon the same pool of "vocal" individuals who use the "letters to the editor" format to reflect their personal views. The need to use the television medium more extensively through mobile units that could record local concerns and broadcast them via the public access channel of cable television was discussed as a strong possibility for improving the interaction between the media and the Big Island public.

The problems relating to privacy and morality were also discussed. For example, how do we determine whether or not pornographic type programs are broadcasted or not? How do we differentiate situations where monitoring attempts are made, through technology, for medical reasons--such as, to watch an invalid, and situations where technology is used to video-snoop? These are issues where policies will need to be made, once the media becomes a more intimate part of the social interaction between the members of our society.

B. Cultural Values Oriented Group

This group started their discussion with the concerns for senior citizens who represent all racial groups on the Big Island. One of the primary concerns of the Office of Aging was that there is a lack of communication within and between the government, public agencies, the media, and the general public in informing senior citizens about available services and activities that are of concern to the senior citizens. There are also language, hearing, visual, and other physical difficulties that complicate better interpersonal communication among senior citizens. Lack of mobility and funds among the aged also make communication on all levels difficult. The size of the Big Island poses special problems to the overworked but enthusiastic staff of the Office of Aging who feel that educational programs need to reach senior citizens more effectively, and better feedback channels are

needed to monitor on-going services for the aged, such as the Information Referral Service.

Other concerns related to the need for providing opportunities for minorities as well as individuals, as opposed to large organizations, to express their ideas and values. The Media Advisory Council that was developed six years ago by the Tribune Herald to handle complaints, has been extremely concerned about this problem. Ethnic problems, such as those faced by the Hawaiians, Filipinos, and Japanese should be reported from the different ethnic perspectives. Perhaps this would imply that ethnic resource personnel to report news relating to different ethnic groups are needed or an agency that can provide this service should be created for more equal coverage of minority and/or ethnic groups' problems and issues.

The group then discussed the need to make access easier for "John Q. Public" who doesn't take advantage of the available resources, who doesn't care about participating or who feels intimidated because participation is too difficult. Some members of this group expressed interest in starting a council that could develop the Big Island cable possibilities--to insure a constant information flow of local activities, and to aid local groups in using available technology to have their views expressed more effectively, and to strive for more two-way communication among the Big Islanders.

Other formats for insuring more representative views of the public were expressed. Some of the formats suggested were: a public editorial column, a radio "town forum" type program, and an organizations' radio day (where an organization could broadcast for a day).

These were the highlights of the two major groups that met for the Big Island Right to Communicate Dialog session on April 24, 1976, from 8:45 a.m. to 12:00 noon at the Hilo Meisholn Hall.

From an academic humanist's standpoint, the issues discussed were as they should have been--concerned with the beliefs, values, and attitudes of the people of the Big Island. More specifically, the entire thrust of the dialog session was on equality: in utilizing the channels available for information flow among the members of the Big Island whenever possible, and in having the coders of messages (the media) become more sensitive to the need for more two-way communication in reporting to the people of the Big Island.

HUMAN COMMUNICATION NEEDS AND THE NEW COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES

by John Dobovan and Sheila Dobovan

As communications technology becomes increasingly complex and integral to our lives, it is ironic that, like Frankenstein's child, it is less and less under our individual control. We've come a long way from town meetings and hand printed broadsides. We can communicate now in ways which our forefathers could never have dreamt. But is this communications technology, and television in particular, being used in the most effective manner? While we cannot presume to answer this question

In terms of national or global policy, we do hope to provide some sort of perspective in terms of Hawaii Island.

Hawaii Island is called the Big Island for good reason: with less than 10% of the State's population, it has over half of its land mass. Traditionally the Big Island has been a rural agrarian society, but, in recent years, as sugar revenues dropped, other industries, such as tourism, have become increasingly important. Tourism, however, brings an influx of outsiders and tends to change land values, social mores, and demographic composition; all of which is seen as a threat to the present lifestyle of some lifelong residents. The resulting values clash, coupled with problems inherent in a multi-cultural society and problems created by sheer geographic distance on an island of this size, would seem to make the Big Island an ideal place for innovative and effective communications policy and practice.

Unfortunately, this has not been the case. The basic mass communication tools of our era--radio, newspaper and television--evolved here into an ineffectual crazy-quilt pattern which is often counter-productive to improved communications. Hawaii Island is served by one major local paper which is based in Hilo and owned by a mainland interest. In addition, there are several weeklies, tabloids and "underground" publications, as well as the two major Honolulu papers. All in all, only the Hilo paper and one of the Honolulu papers have any appreciable island-wide circulation.

Radio is far more limited. Hilo has three stations and Kona has one, with reception confined primarily to those two areas. Some portions of the island can pick up a signal from Maui or even Honolulu, but no one station reaches the entire island.

With one exception, all broadcast television reception here originates from Honolulu. The Public Station carries an occasional feature about Big Island, but their fixed budget precludes regular neighbor island coverage. The three network affiliates, on the other hand, rarely have anything more than a sixty-second spot on the news. By and large, the broadcast television which reaches the Big Island has little or nothing to do with Big Island issues and values. Hilo sees far more of the mythical Fernwood, Ohio, than it does of Kailua-Kona. One exception should be noted--KGMD, the local CBS affiliate, recently refurbished their transmitter facility and resumed local broadcasts in the form of a half-hour public affairs program on Sunday afternoons. This station had tried local programming several years ago as a commercial venture which eventually failed. The new show is provided as a community service by the Honolulu ownership, and is hosted by a Hilo realtor who discusses issues with selected guests in a studio format. Although this does constitute a step toward "localized" communication responsive to community needs, the program is still limited by the sterile environment of the studio and by the one-way approach to communication inherent in broadcast programming. We have long felt that television could and should be made more interactive but the questions of how and in what ways are not easily solved. Cable television may hold part of that answer.

Cable has primarily served as a boost for broadcast reception here on the Big Island. Broadcast signal reception varies greatly around the island and cable's

success has inversely followed that pattern. At present there are three cable companies in operation here. The smallest, located in the Ka'u area and furthest from Honolulu, is a notable example of enlightened operation. Until the arrival of cable several years ago, Ka'u received only one of the five broadcast stations operating in the State. Now the residents in Ka'u receive all the Honolulu stations plus a weekly community program presented by the cable company. The franchise is small (under 1,000 households) but the subscription rate is nearly 100%. Residents can also make use of the message wheel and the company is generally quite receptive to community involvement, providing services in excess of FCC requirements.

Cable on the Kona side is not nearly so well developed at this time. The Kona franchise sprawls over a huge rural area, hardware overhead is high and many homes are simply not accessible to cable. To date, no public access channel is available although the company has run some material in the past on a space-available basis.

The major franchise on the island is in the Hilo area, with approximately 6,000 subscribers, or nearly half of the households, presently hooked up. Hilo's ethnic heritage is largely Japanese. Consequently, one of cable's primary attractions in Hilo has been the Japanese language station which broadcasts from Honolulu and is unavailable in Hilo without cable. Hilo cable has tried several commercial programming ventures without any notable success to date. They do allow the public to air video material over their local origination/public access/newswire channel but their charter only requires them to provide five minutes of cable time and facilities without charge. Hence, public access is more of a favor granted by the cable company than the rightful use by the public of a public trust. By and large, public access development on the Big Island is minimal and irregular. There is no scheduled public access activity here at present, but that is not to say that there cannot or should not be some regular use made of this avenue.

Can public access work? More to the point, can it work on the Big Island? The answer, of course, is far from clear, but some tentative conclusions can be drawn. If public access is defined as simply another kind of programming, then it is probably doomed. The general public is too sophisticated, too conditioned by broadcast programming, to accept most public access material as a serious substitute. Public access is simply not viable for mass market consumption. On the other hand, it does offer small groups a chance to air materials which have no other outlet. For example, we have done programming with senior citizen's clubs which allowed many individuals to share experiences and expertise in a way never before open to them.

Even more importantly, there are many process or non-programmatic applications which broadcast television has never explored and which, because of low economic incentives, it probably never will. For example, we already have the technology to link people on the Big Island directly to the State Legislature in Honolulu--or Hilo with Kailua-Kona for that matter. On an island as vast as Hawaii, video communication, in either instantaneous or tape-delayed form, could be extremely valuable. Medical data, educational materials or special interest group communication can be exchanged accurately and quickly. It is now possible for community people, using high-quality portable equipment, to work directly in that community, aiding businesses, various groups, and individuals with their communication needs.

As cable develops further here, it will be possible to establish two-way video links across the island, and to create uses for this new technology. Of course, a communications network of this sort will require a degree of cooperation between the cable companies which has hitherto been lacking.

Pipe dreams? Perhaps. Without a unified community, they will remain just that. There is certainly much interest on the Big Island in the potential of public access. Most of this interest is still centered around programming though, and consists of numerous individuals and small groups hoping to carve out an empire in this small but growing field. Big Island Video is trying to forge together an organization which is composed of representative agencies and interest groups on Hawaii Island and which can serve as a major force in developing public access policy, in obtaining funding and equipment, and which can use these resources for the betterment of the community.

Our work includes both programming and process or non-programming. The potential of quality programming is tremendous when one considers the rich human and natural resources which exist on the Big Island. In an era of increased ethnic awareness, we feel it is important that programs should exist which represent life on Hawaii Island: its people, their customs and philosophies; its history and heritage. Upcoming projects include a documentary on the 1946 tsunami and its effect on Hilo's development; and a major project on the people of Ka'u. These programs will be sent to the Public Station, KHET, in Honolulu, for statewide broadcast and will be offered over cable as well. We expect to develop many more programs, each with a different focus. Some may deal with Youth, Women, and Senior Citizen's groups.

Process, or non-programmatic, development is one of our long-range goals which emerges from our relationship with member organizations and from the needs of the community as seen by our membership. This work will encompass civic clubs, government agencies, local businesses, health organizations, and many more. Training tapes, video conferences, and inter-group as well as intra-group communication are only a few of the possibilities.

We hope that, by reaching deep into the community, we can identify some of its basic communications needs and take action to meet those needs. We also hope to develop long-range funding sources, either through our member organizations, or directly with governmental and private sources. Lastly, we hope to reach some understanding with the cable companies which will allow us, the general public, to develop our own uses for the new technology which they hold in trust for us, that we may better serve the communications needs of the Big Island.

RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE: THE BIG ISLAND AND BEYOND

by Fred O. Reedy

The authors of the U.S. Constitution met the task of insuring a free society by first guaranteeing protection of communication rights. Two centuries ago, that simply meant promising the citizens of the United States that their government would never take from them their rights to freedom of the press, freedom of speech

nor freedom of assembly. Two centuries ago, the guarantee extended to all existing forms of communication.

The Founding Fathers knew that for their revolution to succeed, for their infant nation to grow strong among its world neighbors, its people had to be free to exchange ideas and information. The First Amendment to the Constitution was a foundation upon which to unite the citizens of 13 vast but sparsely-populated colonies.

But in the two centuries since the time a message could travel no faster over distances than a horse could carry it, another revolution has occurred, one with global implications as profound as those of the struggle for a nation's independence. The revolution in communications technology enabling men to gather and distribute information over infinite distances at the speed of light is mankind's attempt to overthrow ignorance, the most oppressive tyrant of all.

But what Founding Fathers are guiding the new revolution, laying the social groundwork for its success? What benevolent and wise father is guaranteeing mankind's rights to enjoy the fruits of the new revolution?

In 1776, a man's ability to communicate was limited by the capabilities of his voicebox as he stood on a soap box in the town square, or the hand-carried circulation of the pamphlets he cranked out on a basement press. He could reach as many people as would stop to read or listen, but he had no advantages nor disadvantages with regards to anyone else in his small, homogeneous society.

But this equality has been upset by the technological revolution in communications. Modern communication depends on knowledge of and access to media outlets of varying sophistication and, equally important, the ability to pay for the service. Equipment may be as common and easy to use as the telephone or as distant and complex as a communications satellite.

The potential exists for man to enrich and broaden his experiences through global communication, but his right to it, beyond what Americans are guaranteed in the Constitution, remains undefined, and therefore, does not exist. Rather, access to communication media has become a privilege in both the world and local communities.

The problem of simply stating communication rights has become as complex as our society and its technology. What is probably most disturbing is that very few of our political leaders are as anxious as their predecessors to see communication rights guaranteed. The federal government has taken control, through licensing, of the airwaves and in the elections of Richard Nixon, we have seen our electoral process bring to power men who would subvert even the Constitutional guarantees of speech and press freedom.

Compounding the problem is the conflict that arises between our needs to communicate and our rights to privacy, also largely unstated in a modern context. Individual privacy must be protected against information gathering and storage systems now available to our government. We must assume, of course, that our

foreign and domestic spying technique will only continue to evolve, though many feel it has gone too far already.

Cultural privacy must be guarded against everything that causes cultures to clash as they are squeezed together in an ever-shrinking world. A recent example was the voyage of the Hokule'a to Tahiti. National Geographic staffers and Polynesian crewmen reportedly came to blows over the role of the media in an event meant to foster reverence for Pacific culture.

Given the rapid growth of both the media and communications hardware industries, the population of even the relatively sophisticated United States remains largely unaware of what information and services are available, much less how to get at them. The sheer size of the media industry that serves us through newspaper, magazines, television, radio and the movies--all commonly used in everyday life--intimidates the average citizen to the point of telling him to "take it or leave it."

The question remains: Has 200 years of progress taken from us the communication rights our Founding Fathers recognized people must have, even those which they could not have foreseen?

It is a question that pleads for an answer even when it isn't asked. Communication rights, like all other rights, exist only to the extent people recognize and exercise them, given the opportunity. They cannot exist until they are identified and asserted.

DISCUSSION

Most of the points in the notes taken by the rapporteurs are covered by the three previous papers. However, Erlinda Villamor, a reporter for the Hawaii Tribune Herald was present and her article is included in its entirety.

SPEAK UP, JOHN Q. PUBLIC: Workshop on Right to Communicate

by Erlinda Villamor

John Q. Public was told Saturday he ought to shed any feeling of "intimidation" he may have if he is to be heard, seen or read in the Big Island's news media.

A dialogue session, "The Right of Everyone in Hawaii to Communicate," held at the Hilo Meishoin, drew some 50 participants from the Big Island and Honolulu in a highly freewheeling discussion on public access to the news media.

The forum, also being held on Oahu, Kauai, and Maui with funds from the Hawaii Committee for the Humanities, was aimed at "encouraging concerned Big Islanders to evaluate their communication needs and the institution serving those needs."

What emerged from the 3 1/2-hour session was the consensus that Big Islanders have to contend with a problem peculiar to the multi-racial community: having a single islandwide newspaper and non-islandwide radio stations. The need, it was agreed upon, is to educate the community on how to make use of what they've got.

It's a tall order for John Q. Public, it was pointed out.

Fred Reedy, project coordinator for the Big Island said the public seems to be suffering from a case of "intimidation" by the news media. Other participants spoke of the "ignorance on the part of the public on the proper way of getting to the media." Some may feel they can't write properly in "King's language," or are not sure how they would present their ideas. Some are simply afraid to speak out.

The greater part of the discussion focused on the Tribune-Herald. Concern was raised on the difficulty of the individual to have his personal views expressed in the newspaper's editorial page. Although organizations do not seem to have that problem, John Q. Public, it was pointed out, it could be an exercise in futility.

Bill Wright of the Media Advisory Council, one of the forum's sponsoring organizations on the Big Island, said his group's overriding concern has been the right of the reader "to respond on any issue" in the Tribune-Herald's editorial page. He said this need becomes more acute when a reader feels "facts are being misstated."

Still another concern voiced was coverage of Hawaii news by "haole" reporters. Said one participant: "A non-Hawaiian can cover the Kahoolawe case or the Hawaiian Land Claims, but he wouldn't have the same perspective and feelings that a Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian would have on these issues."

Tribune-Herald News Editor Charles Bell, responding to a question, assured the group that the paper's reporters are in no way hamstrung by editorial constraints. "Under no circumstances is a reporter asked to cover an event from a certain angle to conform with an editorial stand," he said.

Bell also said that if the community is not getting "opposing views," it might be because of lack of competition. Perhaps another newspaper would afford the balance on news coverage that one newspaper may not be able to provide, he said.

Cited as a group with special communications problems were the island's elderly. Gladys Bowell, executive director of the Office of the Aging, another sponsoring group for the workshop, said the senior citizens are a group "we are not communicating with."

Hearing problems, failing eyesight and language difficulties combine to make the elderly the most isolated group in the community, she said "Some don't even have radios or TV sets in their homes," Miss Bowell said.

Hugh Clark, Big Island bureau chief for the Honolulu Advertiser said he is getting feedback from the public, especially "from those who do not have any access at all to the media."

A plan was broached by Bob Youngman, spokesman for the Big Island Chamber of Commerce, to organize a community-sponsored program "to pursue the problem of access to new media." Alan Parker of the Office of the Aging such a program could spearhead public workshops on how to submit material to newspapers, radio and television.

Participants were asked to evaluate the Right to Communicate Workshop. Written comments from participants include the following representative ones: "Timely topic. Good presentation and discussion. Worthwhile." "I am very pleased with the results and look forward to participating in positive community efforts suggested." "One meeting is not enough." . . .